WHOSE RESPONSIBILITY?

A Study of Transnational Defence Rights and Mutual Recognition of Judicial Decisions within the EU

Malin Thunberg Schunke
Whose Responsibility? A Study of Transnational Defence Rights and Mutual Recognition of Judicial Decisions within the EU
Malin Thunberg Schunke

© 2013 Intersentia
Cambridge – Antwerp – Portland
www.intersentia.com | www.intersentia.co.uk

Cover illustration: Francisco De Goya (1746-1828), Etching, Plate 32 from ‘Los desastres de la guerra’

ISBN 978-1-78068-175-7
D/2013/7849/88
NUR 828


No part of this book may be reproduced in any form, by print, photoprint, microfilm or any other means, without written permission from the publisher.
PREFACE

Professor Iain Cameron has given a significant contribution to this book, first of all by reading and commenting on a first draft. His constructive criticism and high level of professional skills have to a considerable extent enriched and improved the quality of the final version of the manuscript. Many thanks also for enormous patience and support regarding all kinds of practical issues. Professor Magnus Ulväng has given generous guidance and been extremely helpful in different ways. Words of deepest gratitude also go to Professor Nils Jareborg who offers never-ending support and encouragement. As you well know, you are the main reason for my return to academic work in Uppsala.

A generous scholarship from Institutet för rättsvetenskaplig forskning financed this project. In this respect, the help of Professor Anna Singer was invaluable.

Finally, as always, nothing is possible without the inspiration from Maximilian, Emma, Nicholas, Alexander and the rest of the great Thunberg Schunke-clan.

Malin Thunberg Schunke
Hannover, April 2013
ABOUT THE AUTHOR

Dr. Malin Thunberg Schunke is an Associate Professor in Criminal Law at the University of Uppsala. She holds an LLD in Criminal Law (Uppsala University) and an LLM in Criminology and Criminal Justice (King’s College, London). Her research interests lie in national and international criminal law particularly EU judicial cooperation in criminal matters and human rights. She has been an Apprentice Judge at Stockholm City Court and has been working several years as an Assistant Prosecutor at the Prosecuting Office Stockholm.
CONTENTS

Preface ................................................................. v
About the author ......................................................... vii
Abbreviations ........................................................... xiii

1. Introduction .......................................................... 1
1.1. Being a defendant within the European Union: Garry Mann, Andrew
     Symeou and the Stow brothers ........................................ 1
1.2. The need for EU action on defence rights ........................................... 5
1.3. Scope and overall structure of the study .............................................. 6
     1.3.1. The principle of mutual recognition of judicial decisions ........... 6
     1.3.2. The purpose of the project ............................................. 9

2. Human rights protection at the legislative level within the EU ........ 13
2.1. EU instruments on criminal procedural rights ...................................... 13
2.2. EU instruments on mutual recognition of decisions .............................. 15

3. Human rights protection at the national level ........................................ 21
3.1. Introduction ....................................................................... 21
3.2. Swedish legislation and case-law regarding the EAW ...................... 22
     3.2.1. The Act (2003:1156) on Surrender from Sweden according to
             the European Arrest Warrant ........................................... 22
     3.2.2. Swedish case-law ...................................................... 24
     3.2.3. Commentary to the Swedish case-law .................................. 30
3.3. English legislation and case-law regarding the EAW ...................... 30
     3.3.1. The Extradition Act 2003 ............................................. 30
     3.3.2. English case-law ...................................................... 33
     3.3.3. Commentary to the English case-law ................................ 38
     3.3.4. National review of the extradition system ........................... 38
     3.3.5. The UK’s 2014 opt-out decision ................................... 39

4. Human rights protection and the ECHR ............................................. 41
4.1. Introduction ....................................................................... 41
4.2. The principle of extraterritorial state responsibility ........................... 41
4.3. The ECHR and the European Union ............................................. 53
5. The Charter of Fundamental Rights and the CJEU ......................... 55
  5.1. The EU Charter of Fundamental Rights ................................... 55
  5.2. The CJEU ............................................................................. 57
    5.2.1. The Jurisdiction of the CJEU ............................................. 57
    5.2.2. The Radu and Melloni cases ............................................ 58
      5.2.2.1. Criminal Proceedings against Radu .................................. 58
      5.2.2.2. Melloni v. Ministerio Fiscal ........................................ 60
    5.2.2.3. Commentary .................................................................. 64
  5.3. The system of protecting fundamental rights after the Treaty of Lisbon ................................................ 68

6. Is there a sufficient system of human rights protection within cooperation based on mutual recognition? .................. 69
  6.1. Introduction .................................................................. 69
  6.2. National human rights bars ........................................... 72
    6.2.1. Introduction .................................................................. 72
    6.2.2. Tight time limits ......................................................... 73
    6.2.3. The burden of proof and evidentiary difficulties ............ 75
    6.2.4. The “political” element .................................................. 79
    6.2.5. The stringent threshold of “flagrant denial” ...................... 80
    6.2.6. Conclusions ................................................................. 80
  6.3. The ECtHR and the principles for extraterritorial state responsibility . 83
    6.3.1. Introduction .................................................................. 83
    6.3.2. Overload and significant delays ......................................... 84
    6.3.3. The high threshold of “flagrant denial” ............................. 85
    6.3.4. The need for more modern concepts of state responsibility ...... 89
  6.4. Extraterritorial state responsibility and the principle of mutual recognition ......................................................... 93
    6.4.1. The concept of mutual trust ............................................. 93
      6.4.1.1. What does mutual trust mean? ..................................... 93
      6.4.1.2. The interpretation of mutual trust in practice .............. 94
      6.4.1.3. A rejection of blind trust by the European Courts .......... 100
        M.S.S. v. Belgium and Greece ............................................. 100
        N.S. v. Secretary of State for the Home Department
        and M.E. and Others v. Refugee Applications
        Commissioner and Minister for Justice, Equality and
        Law Reform .................................................................. 101
      6.4.1.4. Conclusions on the concept of mutual trust ............... 103
    6.4.2. The need for a higher standard of protection within the mutual recognition system ................................. 109
    6.4.3. Division of labour within the system of mutual recognition ... 112
6.5. Hope for the future: The Charter and the CJEU? .......................... 118
   6.5.1. The impact of the Charter ........................................... 118
   6.5.2. The CJEU as guardian of human rights ............................ 120
6.6. The need for EU instruments on transnational procedural standards .. 123

7. Whose responsibility? ........................................................... 131

Bibliography ................................................................. 135
Index ................................................................. 157
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AC</td>
<td>Law Reports Appeal Court</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art.</td>
<td>Article</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BVerfG</td>
<td>BundesVerfassungsgericht</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BvR</td>
<td>Bundesverfassungsbeschwerden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEPS</td>
<td>Centre for European Policy Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFI</td>
<td>Court of First Instance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charter</td>
<td>The Charter of Fundamental Rights in the European Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CJEU</td>
<td>Court of Justice of the European Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLR</td>
<td>Cork Online Law Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dir.</td>
<td>Utredningsdirektiv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dnr.</td>
<td>Diarienummer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ds.</td>
<td>Departementsserien</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAW</td>
<td>European Arrest Warrant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAW Act</td>
<td>Act (2003:1156) on Surrender from Sweden according to the European Arrest Warrant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC</td>
<td>European Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECBA</td>
<td>European Criminal Bar Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECHR</td>
<td>The European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECJ</td>
<td>European Court of Justice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECR</td>
<td>European Court Reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECtHR</td>
<td>European Court of Human Rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ed.</td>
<td>Editor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EEW</td>
<td>European Evidence Warrant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EIO</td>
<td>European Investigation Order</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EJN</td>
<td>European Judicial Network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERA Forum</td>
<td>Journal of the Academy of European Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESO</td>
<td>European Supervision Order</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU</td>
<td>European Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eucrim</td>
<td>The European Criminal Law Associations’ Forum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EUI</td>
<td>European University Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crim.L.&amp;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crim.Just.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EWCA</td>
<td>England and Wales Court of Appeal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EWHC</td>
<td>England and Wales High Court</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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FD
FD on EAW Council Framework Decision 2002/584/JHA of 13 June 2002 on the European Arrest Warrant and the surrender procedures between Member States

Hanse LR Hanse Law Review
HD Högsta domstolen (Supreme Court in Sweden)
ICLQ The International and Comparative Law Quarterly
ICTR International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda
IEHC Ireland High Court
IESC Ireland Supreme Court
J. Crim. L Journal of Criminal Law
JHA Justice and Home Affairs
JIT Joint Investigation Team
JK Justitiekanslern/Chancellor of Justice
JO Justitieombudsmannen
JuU Justitieutskott
LJN Landelijk Jurisprudentie Nummer (Dutch Case-Law Number)
MIG Migrationsöverdomstolen
MLR Modern Law Review
NAW Nordic Arrest Warrant
NGO Non-governmental Organisation
NIQB Northern Ireland Queens Bench of High Court of Justice
NJA Nytt juridiskt arkiv, Avd. I
No. Number
OJ Official Journal of the European Union
OLG Oberlandesgericht
p. Page
Para. Paragraph
prop. Proposition
QB Queen’s Bench (Division)
RB Rättegångsbalken (1942:740)
RIDP Revue Internationale de Droit Pénal
Rskr. Riksdagskrivelse (Parliamentary papers)
SFS Svensk författningssamling
SIPRI Stockholm International Peace Research Institute
SOU Statens offentliga utredningar
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SvJT</td>
<td>Svensk juristtidning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEU</td>
<td>Treaty on European Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TFEU</td>
<td>Treaty on the functioning of the European Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UKHL</td>
<td>United Kingdom House of Lords</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UKSC</td>
<td>United Kingdom Supreme Court</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN</td>
<td>United Nations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNTS</td>
<td>United Nations Treaty Series</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utrecht L.Rev.</td>
<td>Utrecht Law Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v.</td>
<td>Versus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vol.</td>
<td>Volume</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WLR</td>
<td>Weekly Law Reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZaöRv</td>
<td>Zeitschrift für ausländisches öffentliches Recht und Völkerrecht</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZIS</td>
<td>Zeitschrift für Internationale Strafrechtsdogmatik</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZStW</td>
<td>Zeitschrift für die gesamte Strafrechtswissenschaft</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>