

FUNDAMENTAL RIGHTS AND BEST INTERESTS
OF THE CHILD IN TRANSNATIONAL FAMILIES

With the financial support of: the Jean Monnet Modules on 'European Family Law', Nos. 542609-LLP-1-2013-1-IT-AJM-MO and 553498-EPP-1-2014-1-IT-EPPJMO-MODULE; and of the Research project PRID on 'Continuità transfrontaliera dello status filiationis e tutela dell'interesse superiore del minore', financed by the Department of Legal Sciences of the University of Udine, Italy.

FUNDAMENTAL RIGHTS AND
BEST INTERESTS OF THE CHILD
IN TRANSNATIONAL FAMILIES

Edited by
Elisabetta BERGAMINI
Chiara RAGNI
in collaboration with
Francesco DEANA



intersentia

Cambridge – Antwerp – Chicago

Intersentia Ltd
8 Wellington Mews
Wellington Street | Cambridge
CB1 1HW | United Kingdom
Tel.: +44 1223 736 170
Email: mail@intersentia.co.uk
www.intersentia.com | www.intersentia.co.uk

Distribution for the UK and Ireland:

NBN International
Airport Business Centre, 10 Thornbury Road
Plymouth, PL6 7PP
United Kingdom
Tel.: +44 1752 202 301 | Fax: +44 1752 202 331
Email: orders@nbninternational.com

Distribution for Europe and all other countries:

Intersentia Publishing nv
Groenstraat 31
2640 Mortsel
Belgium
Tel.: +32 3 680 15 50 | Fax: +32 3 658 71 21
Email: mail@intersentia.be

Distribution for the USA and Canada:

Independent Publishers Group
Order Department
814 North Franklin Street
Chicago, IL 60610
USA
Tel.: +1 800 888 4741 (toll free) | Fax: +1 312 337 5985
Email: orders@ipgbook.com

Fundamental Rights and Best Interests of the Child in Transnational Families
© The editors and contributors severally 2019

The editors and contributors have asserted the right under the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988, to be identified as authors of this work.

No part of this book may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form, or by any means, without prior written permission from Intersentia, or as expressly permitted by law or under the terms agreed with the appropriate reprographic rights organisation. Enquiries concerning reproduction which may not be covered by the above should be addressed to Intersentia at the address above.

Artwork on cover: New York through the eyes of children (2019)

ISBN 978-1-78068-665-3
D/2019/7849/123
NUR 828

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data. A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library.

*To Caterina, Costanza, Davide, Luca and Nicola, who not only give
colour to our lives but have also given it to the cover of this book*

PREFACE

The idea of devoting this book to the relationship between the fundamental rights of the child and European family law stems from the Jean Monnet Modules on European Family Law, funded by the European Commission, in the years 2013/2016 and 2014/2017 at our respective Universities (University of Milano and University of Udine).

During the lectures and seminars that we organised in the framework of these modules, as coordinators, we realised that even though family law is currently considered a hot topic and is subject to intensive research in the academic world, one of the most relevant issues in the European context, that still has not been thoroughly explored, was the one related to the need to protect the rights of children both in the framework of the free movement of citizens and migration law and in the context of international private law. Thirty years have passed since the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child was adopted: the aim of this book is also to assess how and to what extent its provisions have been implemented in family-related matters, with special regard to the European context.

Notwithstanding the lack of any EU competence on family matters that fall into the exclusive jurisdiction of national law, the protection of families and family ties within EU Member States should actually be guaranteed as a means of protecting fundamental rights, and this becomes even more relevant when dealing with minors. The right to family life is indeed included in the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union (the EU Charter) and in the European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR), both of which, according to the EU Treaty, impose legal duties on Member States. Specific norms regarding the rights of children can be found both in the Charter (at Article 24), and in the case law of the ECtHR, which state, in accordance with the 1989 UN Convention on the Rights of the Child, that minors (being EU citizens or third country nationals) have the right to protection and care as is necessary for their well-being. In accordance with both international and European law, minors' views must be taken into account and their best interests must be a primary consideration when taking any action relating to them.

As the analysis of the jurisprudence of both the domestic and the European courts clearly suggests, the protection of minors' rights may prove to be a challenging issue when judges are called to strike a balance between fundamental public values and the individual rights specifically concerned,

or between the abstract and the particular dimension of the best interests of the child, in cases where different conclusions may be reached depending on the perspective adopted.

The impact of human rights on EU legislation dealing with matters which are strictly connected with children and family issues (like for example Directives on family reunification, or private international law rules on child abduction and on parental rights) has already been questioned before the Court of Justice of the European Union and the European Court of Human Rights; their case law confirms the need for interpretative tools aimed at coordinating and reconciling European rules with national public concerns and with the need for human rights protection.

Therefore, we decided to involve academics coming from different countries in the making of this book, in order to assess, *de iure condito* and *de iure condendo*, what legal options, among those suggested by both practitioners and scholars, seem to be most effective for the purpose of balancing the different interests that come into play, notably in situations related to migration (within the EU and from outside the EU), and in cross-border circumstances where private international law issues may arise.

The book addresses the matter from two perspectives: on the one hand it examines how the obligations deriving from Article 8 of the ECHR and from Article 7 of the EU Charter can be coordinated with migration policies and rules, especially in the case where these lead to results which are inconsistent with the protection of the children's family ties; on the other hand, it focuses on the impact of human rights values on the recognition of a parent-child relationship formed abroad, on the content of the public policy exception and finally on the implementation of some EU controversial conflict of law rules, such as those regarding child abduction.

Moreover, beyond the sectoral challenges in different areas of European family law, the book aims at offering a contribution to the definition of the content and of the nature of the general principle of the best interests of the child as related not only to the need to have his/her interests prevail over those of the other members of the family and, in some cases, over the public interest in strictly regulating migration flows, but also to the need to strike a balance between the different needs and interests of the single child whose case is being evaluated. These issues are in fact still controversial, as the practice and the existing literature on these matters confirm; this uncertainty has resulted in practical difficulties for those trying to apply it. Therefore, we wanted to offer academics and practitioners not only a solid reconstruction of the existing legal framework and evolution of the supranational and national case law on these issues, but also perspectives on their possible future evolution through a critical analysis of each connected aspect, taking into account all the possible dimensions of the best interests of the child (see General Comment no. 14/2003, where the

Committee on the Rights of the Child underlines that the best interests of the child should be understood as a right, a principle and a rule of procedure).

In the first part of the book, the introductory chapter (Elisabetta Bergamini) analyses the main supranational principles in the field of children's rights and assesses the global impact of such principles on domestic family law in EU Member States, notably on children, in cases related to EU free movement and migration law. The analysis mainly focuses on the CRC (UN Convention on the Rights of the Child of 1989), due to the specificity of its provisions on the best interests of the child, the ECHR and the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the EU, in order to evaluate whether cross-border situations (stemming from free movement of EU citizens and their families or from migration situations) affect the different national legal frameworks leading towards a higher-level of protection of children's rights as well as a more satisfying and comprehensive application of the international instruments meant to protect human (or more specifically children's) rights. The specific issues evaluated (the case of children born out of wedlock, the right of the child to maintain a relationship with an extended family, the right of the child to be heard and the prohibition of inhuman treatment) leads the author to remark that children's rights that are more closely linked to cross-border situations appear to be headed for a higher level of protection based on the international framework, while more general rights that are not strictly linked to free movement, such as the right of the child to be heard, still need to be fully implemented.

The following chapters deal with selective topics concerning the protection of children within EU Member States, mainly chosen due to their particular relevance, sensitiveness and timeliness. Sexual orientation (Alina Tryfonidou), integration of family patterns based on different religions (Alessandra Lang), protection of family identity as a fundamental right (Francesco Deana), derogation from State sovereignty on migration law (Maura Marchegiani and Peter Rodrigues), domestic violence (Sara De Vido), are those that we selected for the above-mentioned reasons.

All the chapters take into consideration EU substantive law and consider situations in which the still existing differences in domestic family law that are felt to be the expression of the States' social, cultural and legal identity, might deprive children from benefiting from their best interests and their family unity protections within the EU. However, the authors had to adopt different kind of approach to each specific topic. Thus, some authors (Tryfonidou and Lang, respectively dealing with rainbow families and *kafala*) consider the analysis of domestic praxis that could breach human rights principles where it rigidly implements EU legislation (thus suggesting a human-rights-oriented interpretation of EU law that advocates the necessity for the EU to clarify that *all* EU Member States are required by EU law to recognise the exact legal ties among the members of a family when EU law on free movement of persons

is applied). Consequently, this approach clearly takes into consideration the reforming pressure on Member States to establish new rules in order not to discriminate under national law in purely internal situations (in the case of rainbow families) and examines the difficult balance between the need to protect the child's best interests and to avoid circumvention of national and EU rules on migration (in the case of *kafala*).

Other authors, specifically Deana, Marchegiani and Rodrigues, start from a case law approach on transnational family situations and assess how best interests and human rights are/must be taken into account in order to grant children the highest level of protection through an expanded implementation of the existing EU rules of international protection of child migrants, even though it runs counter to the States' prerogatives in migration policies. In this framework they specifically analyse the centrality of EU citizenship as the key to protect the identity of children (Deana), the need to protect children through a human rights-oriented application of family reunification (Rodrigues) and the impact of the best interests principle in cases of peculiar vulnerability such as in the case of asylum-seeking and refugee children (Marchegiani). Even more detailed is the analysis set in the chapter in which Sara De Vido considers the need to protect children, especially girls, from child marriages and violence, suggesting the need to reform the Directive on family reunification in order to respect the Council of Europe Istanbul Convention on preventing and combating violence against women and domestic violence.

What emerges from all the chapters included in the first part of this book is the clear need to grant a higher level of protection to children in cross-border situations. Furthermore, the development of an EU human rights-oriented approach to these situations – also thanks to the influence of ECtHR case-law – could grant an increased level of protection to children in internal situations too.

The second part of the book is devoted to the analysis of the impact of human rights law on conflict of laws rules. It is introduced by two chapters (Pietro Franzina and Marcella Di Stefano) that address this matter focusing both on the EU and on the domestic perspective. While in fact both national and European private international law rules should be read in the light of a human rights-oriented approach, the means of achieving this result may be different, according to the goals pursued.

In the context of the EU the harmonisation of conflict of law rules is aimed at creating an area of freedom, security and justice in order to promote the free movement of persons, and is also a means of ensuring the cross-border recognition of a person's rights and status. In addition, as far as family and child-related matters are concerned, the protection of the fundamental rights of the persons involved, with specific regard to the child's best interests, are among the considerations underlying how the rules are formulated and how the choice of the appropriate connecting factor is made.

If one considers for example the Brussels II *bis* Regulation, which is the main topic of the last four chapters of Part II, the choice of the habitual residence of the child as a connecting factor was properly guided by the idea that the court, identified on that ground, is presumably the one better placed to conduct a proper and reliable assessment of the child's actual situation and interests. At the same time, the Regulation includes norms on the return procedure in cases of abduction (Ruth Lamont), that are aimed on the one hand at ensuring the right of the child to maintain personal relations with both parents (which is prescribed by both the New York Convention, Article 9 and by the EU Charter, Article 24) and on the other, at granting the possibility of assessing whether the return corresponds to the best interests of the child. To this end the Regulation provides: specific exceptions to the return (in this respect it should be pointed out that one of the most debated issues – as shown in the chapter written by Costanza Honorati – specifically regards the possibility to conceive, also in the light of the 1980 Hague Convention, a general human rights exception to the return); the right of the child to be heard; and the power for the competent judicial authorities to order provisional measures aimed at ensuring protection of the returned child in cases where his/her well-being may be at risk (Lidia Sandrini). Since all these issues were discussed on the occasion of the Recast, chapters dealing with the matter broadly take into account not only the rules included in the Brussels II *bis* Regulation but also the changes introduced with the Recast, the latter mostly being the result of considerations related to the protection of the child's best interests (Laura Carpaneto).

As regards the impact of human rights on the functioning of domestic conflict of law rules in family matters, a question arises as to whether and to what extent the protection of the child's best interests binds states to recognise a parent-child relationship established abroad, notwithstanding that the strict application of private international law rules would lead to the opposite result. The second and third chapters (Marcella Distefano and Roberto Baratta), which adopt a comprehensive and inclusive perspective on the matter, both consider whether private international law could be interpreted and applied consistently with the rights to private and family life, the respect of which may entail the cross-border recognition of personal and family status. They explore different options at stake like the use of interpretative tools that for example allow the inclusion of considerations on human rights among public policy grounds or the adoption of rules that are aimed at achieving specific material results (for example rules that make a choice among different alternative connecting factors contingent upon the establishment of valid a parent-child relationship). The same questions are addressed in the fourth and fifth chapters, with regard to specific topics, namely the cross-border recognition of the status *fili* arising from the recourse to surrogacy agreements

(Katarina Trimmings) and the effects that foreign adoption are likely to produce in countries where, under recurring circumstances, the adoption of minors would not be allowed (Chiara Ragni). In all these situations, as clarified by the ECtHR, States are not under an obligation to automatically recognise the status acquired abroad, but rather to ensure that decisions in this regard are the result of a proper balancing of all the interests involved, with particular regard to those of the child (in this perspective see also the Advisory Opinion which the Court delivered in April 2019 upon the request of the French Court of Cassation). These interests shall prevail over any other consideration and should be taken into account both in the collective and in the individual dimension, especially in the case where these do not coincide.

Elisabetta Bergamini and Chiara Ragni
June 2019

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We wish to thank all the authors for agreeing to be involved in this project, for sharing their passion and knowledge with us and for their patience in the length of the different phases of the project. We are deeply grateful to them, but we are even more greatly indebted to Francesco Deana, who not only wrote a chapter for this book, but also collaborated with us in all the background activities necessary to coordinate and edit the contributions, providing us excellent support in all the different phases of this project. All of his efforts and suggestions were essential in finalising this editorial project and we wish to give him our heartfelt thanks for everything he has done.

We also would like to thank our PhD candidates (Laura Lizzi and Brigida Varesano) for helping us in the final checking phases before publication.

CONTENTS

<i>Preface</i>	vii
<i>Acknowledgements</i>	xiii
<i>List of Cases</i>	xxi
<i>List of Authors</i>	xxvii

PART I. THE IMPACT OF HUMAN RIGHTS AND OF THE BEST INTERESTS OF THE CHILD ON EU FREE MOVEMENT AND MIGRATION LAW

Human Rights of Children in the EU Context: Impact on National Family Law

Elisabetta BERGAMINI	3
1. Introduction	3
2. Analyses of Human Rights Rules Relevant in the Field of Interest	5
3. Children's Rights in the Interpretative Activity of the CJEU	10
4. Children's Rights and the Evolution of Domestic Family Law: Specific Issues	12
5. Final Remarks	19

Protecting EU Citizen Minors' Right to Identity in the Transnational Family Context

Francesco DEANA	21
1. Introduction	21
2. Identity as a Fundamental Right under International and EU Law	22
3. The Relevance of Children's Identity-Related Issues to EU Law	24
4. Non-Recognition of a Child's Name as a Hindrance to Free Movement	26
5. Non-Recognition of Other Personal and Family Status Legally Acquired Abroad	28
6. Restrictions on Status Recognition and their Compatibility with EU Law	30
7. Protecting Family Unity and the Enjoyment of Established Family Life	32
8. Final Remarks	35

The Best Interests Principle’s Impact on Decisions Concerning Asylum-Seeking and Refugee Children

Maura MARCHEGIANI 39

1. Introductory Remarks 39
2. A General Instrument of Promotion of the Rights of the Child 41
3. The Best Interests Principle in Regional Instruments 46
4. Influence of the Best Interests Principle on European Jurisprudence 48
5. Implications of the Best Interests Approach for International Protection Procedures 52

Human Rights and the Best Interests of the Child in European Family Reunification Law

Peter RODRIGUES 55

1. Introduction 55
2. Best Interests of the Child in European Migration Law 56
3. EU Family Reunification Law 65
4. *Ruiz Zambrano* Jurisprudence 70
5. Conclusions 72

Rainbow Families and EU Free Movement Law

Alina TRYFONIDOU 75

1. Introduction 75
2. Legal Recognition of Rainbow Families in EU Member States: The Current Situation 76
3. Family Reunification Rights under EU Law: The Position of Children 78
4. The Current (Uncertain) Position of Rainbow Families under EU Law 82
5. Is the Non-Recognition of the Parent-Child Relationship a Breach of EU Law? 84
6. Conclusion 95

***Kafala* and Family Reunification of Third-Country Nationals**

Alessandra LANG 97

1. Introduction 97
2. The 1996 Hague Convention and Migration 99
3. Entry and Residence of Foreign Nationals within the EU 100
4. Family Reunification: EU Legislation 101
5. State Practice 105
6. Seeking Common Principles 110

Against a Girl’s Will: Child Marriages, Immigration and the Directive on Family Reunification	
Sara DE VIDO	115
1. Introduction and Scope of Analysis	115
2. Child Marriages	117
3. Family Reunification under EU Law and Child Marriages.	125
4. Prohibition of Child Marriages, Family Reunification and the Istanbul Convention	130
5. When Denying Family Reunification Causes Violence against Women	133
6. Conclusions	136
PART II. THE BEST INTERESTS OF THE CHILD AS A CONCERN OF HUMAN RIGHTS AND EUROPEAN PRIVATE INTERNATIONAL LAW	
The Place of Human Rights in the Private International Law of the Union in Family Matters	
Pietro FRANZINA	141
1. The Protection of Fundamental Rights in the Union’s Legal System.	142
2. Harmonisation as a Way to Enhance the Protection of Fundamental Rights	145
3. The Impact of Human Rights on the Design of Private International Law Rules	148
4. A Human Rights-Oriented Interpretation of the Union’s Private International Law	152
5. Concluding Remarks	155
The Best Interests of the Child Principle at the Intersection of Private International Law and Human Rights	
Marcella DISTEFANO	157
1. The Relationship between Private International Law and Human Rights	157
2. The Best Interests Principle in International Human Rights Law: Three Concepts in One.	162
3. Best Interests of the Child and Private International Family Law: Towards a Convergence.	165
4. Concluding Remarks	169

Recognition of a Foreign Status <i>Filii</i>: Pursuing the Best Interests Principle	
Roberto BARATTA	171
1. Introduction	171
2. ECtHR Activism as to the <i>Ordre Public</i> Exception	174
3. Outlining the Best Interests Test	178
4. Conclusion	184
Surrogacy Arrangements and the Best Interests of the Child: The Case Law of the European Court of Human Rights	
Katarina TRIMMINGS	187
1. Introduction	187
2. Case Law Overview	188
3. Recognition of the Legal Parent-Child Relationship	198
4. Conclusion	207
Cross-Border Recognition of Adoption: Rethinking Private International Law from a Human Rights Perspective	
Chiara RAGNI	209
1. Lack of Harmonisation of Family Law in Europe and its Impact on Recognition of Foreign Adoptions	209
2. The International Legal Framework: The 1993 Hague Convention and its Limits	211
3. The Right to the Continuity of Family Status: Social Reality and Legitimate Expectations v. Legal Relationships	215
4. Reconciling Human Rights and Private International Law	220
Protecting Children’s Rights after Child Abduction: The Interaction of the CJEU and ECtHR in Interpreting Brussels II <i>bis</i>	
Ruth LAMONT	225
1. Introduction	225
2. International Child Abduction: The Legal Framework within the EU	226
3. Protecting Children’s Rights on Child Abduction in the Supranational Courts	231
4. Conclusions	242
Cross-Border Parental Child Abduction in the EU: Is there Room for a Human Rights Exception?	
Costanza HONORATI	243
1. Article 20 of the 1980 Hague Convention: Between Public Policy and Fundamental Rights	243

2. The Difficulty of Framing the Scope of Article 20, Particularly with Regard to Article 13(1)(b)	246
3. Application of Article 20 in Purely Conventional Cases	252
4. Is there a Use for Article 20 in EU Abduction Cases?	259
Impact of the Best Interests of the Child on the Brussels II <i>ter</i> Regulation	
Laura CARPANETO	265
1. The Best Interests of the Child and the ‘Brussels II System’: Setting Terms of Reference	265
2. Impact of the BIC Principle: The Structure and Scope of Application	270
3. Rules on Jurisdiction	274
4. More Efficient Circulation of Decisions	277
5. The New Proactive Attitude Toward Hearing the Child and Mediation	279
6. Assessment of the Child’s Situation in ‘Moving’ within the EU Judicial Area	281
7. Is the BIC Better Protected by the New Rules?	284
Provisional Measures and the Best Interests of the Child in the Field of Parental Responsibility	
Lidia SANDRINI	287
1. Introduction	287
2. Jurisdiction on the Substance and Jurisdiction to Issue Interim Relief	289
3. The Presence of the Child or of the Child’s Assets as a Ground of ‘Interim’ Jurisdiction	295
4. Coordination between Measures and Impact on the Notion of ‘Provisional and Protective Measures’	302
5. Conclusions	307
<i>Index</i>	311

LIST OF CASES

COURT OF JUSTICE OF THE EUROPEAN UNION

<i>A v. B</i> , case C-184/14, ECLI:EU:C:2015:479	270
<i>A</i> , case C-523/07, ECLI:EU:C:2009:225	272, 290, 296–297, 299, 304–305, 307
<i>A. v. the Netherlands</i> , case C-550/16, ECLI:EU:C:2018:248	66–67
<i>Aguirre-Zarraga v. Simone Pelz</i> , case C-491/10 PPU, ECLI:EU:C:2010:828 . . .	230, 236, 295
<i>Åkerberg Fransson</i> , case C-617/10, ECLI:EU:C:2013:105	25, 65, 86
<i>Anklagemyndigheden v. Peter Michael Poulsen and Diva Navigation Corp.</i> , case C-286/90, ECLI:EU:C:1992:453	142
<i>Bogendorff von Wolffersdorff</i> , case C-438/14, ECLI:EU:C:2016:401	27, 86
<i>C</i> , case C-435/06, ECLI:EU:C:2014:2461	272
<i>C. v. M.</i> , case C-376/14 PPU, ECLI:EU:C:2014:2268	274
<i>Carpenter</i> , case C-60/00, ECLI:EU:C:2002:434	87, 90
<i>Chakroun v. the Netherlands</i> , case C-578/08, ECLI:EU:C:2010:117	57, 65
<i>Child and Family Agency v. J.D.</i> , case C-428/15, ECLI:EU:C:2016:819 . . .	155, 169, 276, 291
<i>Coleman</i> , case C-303/06, ECLI:EU:C:2008:415	93
<i>Coman</i> , case C-673/16, ECLI:EU:C:2018:385	29, 81
<i>Commission v. France</i> , case 167/73, ECLI:EU:C:1974:35	79
<i>De Cavel v. De Cavel</i> , case 143/78, ECLI:EU:C:1979:83	299
<i>Denilauler v. snc Couchet Frères</i> , case 125/79, ECLI:EU:C:1980:130	292
<i>Doris Povse v. Mauro Alpagó</i> , case C-211/10, ECLI:EU:C:2010:400	237–238, 240
<i>Dynamic Medien Vertriebs GmbH</i> , case C-244/06, ECLI:EU:C:2008:85	11
<i>Freitag</i> , case C-541/15, ECLI:EU:C:2017:432	27
<i>Garcia Avello</i> , case C-148/02, ECLI:EU:C:2003:539	27, 86
<i>Gerardo Ruiz Zambrano v. Office national de l'emploi (ONEm)</i> , case C-34/09, ECLI:EU:C:2011:124	34, 70, 81
<i>Gogova</i> , case C-215/15, ECLI:EU:C:2015:710	291
<i>Grunkin-Paul</i> , case C-353/06, ECLI:EU:C:2008:559	27, 86
<i>H.C. Chavez-Vilchez and Others</i> , case C-133/15 [AG Opinion], ECLI:EU:C:2016:659	11
<i>H.C. Chavez-Vilchez and Others</i> , case C-133/15 [Judgment], ECLI:EU:C:2017:354	34, 71
<i>Health Service Executive v. S.C. and A.C.</i> , case C-92/12 PPU, ECLI:EU:C:2012:255	272, 289, 293, 296
<i>HR</i> , case C-512/17, ECLI:EU:C:2018:513	290
<i>Italian Leather spa v. WECO Polstermöbel GmbH & Co.</i> , case C-80/00, ECLI:EU:C:2002:342	303, 306
<i>J. McB. v. L.E.</i> , case C-400/10 PPU, ECLI:EU:C:2010:582	153
<i>Jasna Deticek v. Maurizio Sgueglia</i> , case C-403/09 PPU, ECLI:EU:C:2009:810	154, 228, 236, 290, 294, 296–298

<i>K. v. Buundesasleyamt</i> , case C-245/11, ECLI:EU:C:2012:685	49
<i>K.A. and Others v Belgische Staat</i> , case C-82/16, ECLI:EU:C:2018:308	34
<i>Konstantinidis</i> , case C-168/91, ECLI:EU:C:1993:115	27
<i>Mario Reichert, Hans-Heinz Reichert and Ingeborg Kockler v. Dresdner Bank AG</i> , case C-261/90, ECLI:EU:C:1992:149	305
<i>Mario Vicente Micheletti and others v. Delegación del Gobierno en Cantabria</i> , case C-360/90, ECLI:EU:C:1992:295	305
<i>Marjan Noorzia v. Bundesministerin für Inneres</i> , case C-338/13, ECLI:EU:C:2014:2092	127–128
<i>Maruko</i> , case C-267/06, ECLI:EU:C:2008:179	86
<i>Matoušková</i> , case C-404/14, ECLI:EU:C:2015:653	271
<i>Mercredi</i> , case C-497/10 PPU, ECLI:EU:C:2010:829	290
<i>Mietz v Intership Yachting Sneek BV</i> , case C-99/96, ECLI:EU:C:1999:202	303, 306
<i>MRAX</i> , case C-459/99, ECLI:EU:C:2002:461	86
<i>Murat Dereci and Others v. Bundesministerium für Inneres</i> , case C-256/11, ECLI:EU:C:2011:734	34, 70
<i>Neli Valcheva v Georgios Babanarakis</i> , case C-335/17 [AG Opinion], ECLI:EU:C:2018:242	76
<i>Neli Valcheva v Georgios Babanarakis</i> , case C-335/17 [Judgment], ECLI:EU:C:2018:359	14, 273
<i>Nold</i> , case 4/73, ECLI:EU:C:1974:51	89
<i>O. and S. v Maahanmuuttovirasto and Maahanmuuttovirasto v. L.</i> , cases C-356/11 and C-357/11, ECLI:EU:C:2012:776	34, 64–65, 81
<i>O. v. Minister voor Immigratie, Integratie en Asiel and Minister voor Immigratie</i> , <i>Integratie en Asiel v. Bcase</i> , case C-456/12, ECLI:EU:C:2014:135	33, 79
<i>OL v PQ</i> , case C-111/17 PPU, ECLI:EU:C:2017:436	290
Opinion of the Court 2/13, 18 December 2014, ECLI:EU:C:2014:2454	57, 241
<i>P v. Q</i> , case C-455/15 PPU, ECLI:EU:C:2015:763	304
<i>Parliament v. Council</i> , case C-540/03, ECLI:EU:C:2006:429	10, 57, 103, 111, 228
<i>Parris</i> , case C-443/15, ECLI:EU:C:2016:897	86
<i>Pfleger</i> , case C-390/12, ECLI:EU:C:2014:281	86
<i>PM v. AH</i> , case C-604/17, ECLI:EU:C:2018:10	292
<i>Pupino</i> , case C-105/03 [AG Opinion], ECLI:EU:C:2004:712	48
<i>Pupino</i> , case C-105/03 [Judgment], ECLI:EU:C:2005:386	9
<i>Purrucker I</i> , case C-256/09, ECLI:EU:C:2010:437	289–290, 299–300
<i>Purrucker II</i> , case C-296/10, ECLI:EU:C:2010:665	287
<i>Rahman</i> , case C-83/11, ECLI:EU:C:2012/519	80, 88, 109
<i>Rendón Marin</i> , case C-165/14, ECLI:EU:C:2016:675	34, 70
<i>Rinau</i> , case C-195/08 PPU, ECLI:EU:C:2008:406	278, 287
<i>Roux v. Belgium</i> , case C-363/89, ECLI:EU:C:1991:41	79
<i>Runevic-Vardyn and Wardyn</i> , case C-391/09 [AG Opinion], ECLI:EU:C:2010:784	23
<i>Runevic-Vardyn and Wardyn</i> , case C-391/09 [Judgment], ECLI:EU:C:2011:291	27, 32
<i>Sanders</i> , case C-400/13 and C-408/13, ECLI:EU:C:2014:2461	269
<i>Saponaro</i> , case C-565/16, ECLI:EU:C:2018:265	271, 291
<i>Sayn-Wittgenstein</i> , case C-208/09, ECLI:EU:C:2010:806	27
<i>Secretary of State for the Home Department v. CS</i> , case C-304/14, ECLI:EU:C:2016:674	11, 34
<i>Secretary of State for the Home Department v. NA</i> , case C-115/15, ECLI:EU:C:2016:487	34

<i>Shirley McCarthy v. Secretary of State for the Home Department</i> , case C-434/09, ECLI:EU:C:2011:277	25
SM, case C-129/18, ECLI:EU:C:2019:248	105, 109
<i>St Paul Dairy Industries NV v. Unibel Exser BVBA</i> , case C-104/03, ECLI:EU:C:2005:255	306
<i>Stauder</i> , case 29/69, ECLI:EU:C:1969:57	89
<i>The Queen, on the application of MA and Others v. Secretary of State for the Home Department</i> , case C-648/11, ECLI:EU:C:2013:367	12, 49, 69, 143
<i>U.D. v. X.B.</i> , case C-393/18 PPU, ECLI:EU:C:2018:835	153, 290, 292, 305
<i>Van Uden Maritime BV v. Firma Deco Line</i> , case C-391/95, ECLI:EU:C:1998:543	289, 297, 303
<i>W and V</i> , case C-499/15, ECLI:EU:C:2017:118	290, 292
<i>Wachauf</i> , case 5/88, ECLI:EU:C:1989:321	86
<i>Yoshikazu Iida v. Stadt Ulm</i> , case C-40/11, ECLI:EU:C:2012:691	68, 88, 134
<i>Zhu and Chen</i> , case C-200/02, ECLI:EU:C:2004:639	27, 81

EUROPEAN COURT OF HUMAN RIGHTS

<i>Abdulaziz, Cabales, and Balkandali v. UK</i> , nos. 9214/80, 9473/81 and 9474/81, ECHR 1985	56, 72
<i>Abubakar v. Malta</i> , nos. 25794/13 and 28151/13, 22.02.2017	50
<i>Abubeker v. Austria and Italy</i> , no. 73874/11, 18.06.2013	51
Advisory Opinion [GC], no. P16-2018-001	xii, 223
<i>Al Nashif v. Bulgaria</i> , no. 509963/99, ECHR 2002	61
<i>Al-Adsani v. United Kingdom</i> [GC], no. 35763/97, ECHR 2001-XI	48, 176
<i>Anayo v. Germany</i> , no. 20578/07, 21.12.2010	13
<i>Belgian Linguistics Case</i> , nos. 1474/62; 1677/62; 1691/62; 1769/63; 1994/63; 2126/64, ECHR 1968	61
<i>Bosphorous Hava Yollari Turizm ve Ticaret Anonim Sirketi v. Ireland</i> , no. 45036/11, ECHR 2005-VI	48, 238, 240
<i>Brauer v. Germany</i> , no. 3545/04, 28.05.2009	13
<i>Braun v. France</i> , no. 1462/18	201
<i>Bronda v. Italy</i> , no. 22430/93, 09.06.1998	14
<i>Chapin and Charpentier v. France</i> , no. 40183/07, 9.6.2016	172
<i>Chbihi Loudoudi and others v. Belgium</i> , no. 52265/10, ECHR 2015	112
<i>Ciubotaru v. Moldova</i> , no. 27138/04, 27.04.2010	23
<i>Collins and Akaziebie v. Sweden</i> , no. 23944/05, 08.03.2007	18
<i>Cusan and Fazzo v. Italy</i> , no. 77/07, 07.01.2014	24
<i>D. v. Belgium</i> , no. 29176/13, 11.09.2014	192–194
<i>Dudgeon v. the United Kingdom</i> , no. 7525/76, 22.10.1981	23
<i>E.B. c. France</i> [GC], no. 43546/02, 22.01.2008	176, 216
<i>El Ghatet v. Switzerland</i> , no. 56971/10,	59, 63
<i>Ferrari v. Romania</i> , no. 1714/10, 28.04.2010	234
<i>Foulon and Bouvet v. France</i> , nos. 9063/14 and 10410/14, 21.07.2016 ...	32, 190–191, 198
<i>Frettè v. France</i> , no. 36515/97, ECHR 2002-I	216
<i>Gas and Dubois v. France</i> , no. 25952/07, ECHR 2012-II	90, 92, 94, 180

<i>Gaskin v. the United Kingdom</i> , no. 10454/83, 07.07.1989	24
<i>Genovese v. Malta</i> , no. 53124/09, 11.10.2011	24
<i>Golder v. United Kingdom</i> , no. 4451/70, 21.02.1975	48, 176
<i>Golemanova v. Bulgaria</i> , no. 11369/04, 17.02.2011	26
<i>Goodwin v. United Kingdom</i> [GC], no. 289957/95, ECHR 2002-VI	23
<i>Guillot v. France</i> , no. 22500/93, 24.10.1993	24
<i>Halimi v. Austria and Italy</i> , no. 53852/11, 18.06.2013	51
<i>Harroudj v. France</i> , no. 43631/09, ECHR 2012	111, 221
<i>Hirsi Jamaa and Others v. Italy</i> , no. 27765/09, ECHR 2012-II	51
<i>Hussein Diirshi and others v. Netherland and Italy</i> , no. 2314/10, 10.09.2013	51
<i>Hussin v. Belgium</i> , no. 70807/01, 6.05.2004	173, 216
<i>I.A.A. and others v. UK</i> , no. 25960/13 ECHR 2016	72
<i>Iosub Caras v. Romania</i> , no. 7198/04, 27.07.2006	232
<i>Raban v. Romania</i> , no. 25437/08, 26.10.2010	232
<i>Izevbekhai and others v. Ireland</i> , no. 43408/08, 17.05.2011	18
<i>J.R.M. v. the Netherlands</i> , no. 16944/90, ECHR 1993	90
<i>Jeunesse v. the Netherlands</i> , no. 12738/10, ECHR 2014	11, 62
<i>Johansen v. Norway</i> , no. 17383/90, 17.01.1995	227
<i>Johansson v. Finland</i> , no. 10163/02, 06.09.2007	24
<i>Josef. v. Belgium</i> , no. 70055/10, 27.02.2014	19
<i>K. and T. v. Finland</i> , no. 25702/94, ECHR 2001-VII	90
<i>K.A. and A.D. v. Belgium</i> , nos. 42756/98 and 45558/98, 17.02.2005	23
<i>K.A. v. Finland</i> , no. 27751/95, 14.01.2003	24
<i>Kanagaratnam v. Belgium</i> , no. 15297/09, 13.12.2011	6
<i>Karner v. Austria</i> , no. 40016/98, ECHR 2003-XI	172, 180
<i>Keegan v. Ireland</i> , no. 16969/90, 26.05.1994	13
<i>Kozak v. Poland</i> , no. 13102/02, 2.03.2010	180
<i>Kroon and others v. The Netherlands</i> , no. 18535/91, 27.10.1994	177
<i>L. v. The Netherlands</i> , no. 45582/99, ECHR 2004	61
<i>Laborie v. France</i> , no. 44024/2013, 19.01.2017	32, 190–191, 198
<i>Levin v. Sweden</i> , no. 35141/06, 15.03.2012	24
<i>M.S.S. v. Belgium and Greece</i> , no. 30696/09, ECHR 2011	69
<i>MA/Sofia Povse and Doris Povse v. Austria</i> , no. 3890/11	238, 240
<i>Manuello and Nevi v. Italy</i> , 107/10, 20.01.2015	14
<i>Marckx v. Belgium</i> , no. 6833/74, 13.06.1979	13, 30, 61, 90, 92, 177
<i>Mary Green and Ajad Farhat v. Malta</i> , no. 38797/07, 6.07.2010	23
<i>Maslov v. Austria</i> , no. 1638/0323, ECHR 2008	72
<i>Maumousseau and Washington v. France</i> , no. 39388/05, 06.12.2007	232
<i>McDonald v. France</i> , no. 18648/04, 29.04.2008	23
<i>Menesson v. France and Labassee v. France</i> , nos. 65192/2011 and 65941/2011, ECHR 2014-III	32, 91, 176, 188, 198
<i>Miruts Hagos v. Netherland and Italy</i> , no. 9053/10, 27.08.2013	51
<i>Mohammed Hassan and others v. The Netherlands and Italy</i> , no. 40524/10, 27.08.2013	51
<i>Mohammed Hussein v. The Netherlands and Italy</i> , no. 27725/10, 02.04.2013	51
<i>Mubilanzila Mayeka et Kaniki Mitunga v. Belgium</i> , no. 13178/03, 12.10.2006	50–51
<i>Muskhadzhiyeva and others v. Belgium</i> , no. 41442/07, 19.01.2010	6
<i>A.M.E. v. The Netherlands</i> , no. 51428/10, 05.02.2015	50
<i>Negrepontis-Giannisis v. Greece</i> , no. 56759/08, 3.05.2011	23, 91, 173, 218

<i>Neulinger and Shuruk v. Switzerland</i> [GC], no. 41615/07, 06.07.2010	49, 72, 167, 176, 179, 232–233
<i>Neulinger in X v. Latvia</i> , no. 27853/09, 26.11.2011	233–234
<i>Niemietz v. Germany</i> , no. 13710/88, 16.12.1992	23
<i>Nistor v. Romania</i> , no. 14565/05, 02.11.2010	14
<i>Norris v. Ireland</i> , no. 10581/83, 26.10.1988	23
<i>Nunez v. Norway</i> , no. 55597/09, ECHR 2011	62
<i>Nylund v. Finland</i> , no. 27110/95, ECHR 1999-VI	90
<i>Odièvre v. France</i> [GC], no. 42326/98, 13.02.2003	24
<i>Oliari and others v. Italy</i> , nos. 18766/11 and 36030/11, 21.07.2015	172, 180
<i>Olsson v. Sweden</i> , no. 10465/83, 24.03.1988	180
<i>Paradiso and Campanelli v. Italy</i> , no. 25358/12, 27.01.2015	30, 116, 177, 180, 190, 194–197, 217–220
<i>Petrovic v. Austria</i> , no. 20458/92, (156/1996/775/976), 27.03.1998	172
<i>Pini and Others v. Romania</i> , nos. 78028/01 and 78030/01, 22.09.2004	216
<i>Pretty v. United Kingdom</i> , no. 2346/02, ECHR 2002-III	23
<i>R. B. A. B. and others v. The Netherlands</i> , no. 7211/06, 07.06.2016	18
<i>R.M.S. v. Spain</i> , no. 28775/12, 18.06.2013	24
<i>Rahimi v. Greece</i> , no. 8687/08, 05.07.2011	50
<i>Rodrigues da Silva and Hoogkamer v. The Netherlands</i> , no. 50435/99, ECHR 2006	62
<i>S. F. and others v. Bulgaria</i> , no. 8138/16, 07.12.2017	20
<i>Saenz and Saenz Cortes v France</i> , no. 11288/18	201
<i>Sahin v. Germany</i> , no. 30943/96, 08.07.2003	14, 179
<i>Schalk and Kopf v. Austria</i> , no. 30141/04, 22.06.2010	172, 180
<i>Senigo Longue and others v. France</i> , no. 19113/09, ECHR 2014	72
<i>Senigo Longue v. France</i> , no. 19113/09, 10.07.2014	50
<i>Serife Yigit v. Turkey</i> , no. 3976/05, 2.11.2005	129
<i>Severe v. Austria</i> , no. 53661/15, 21.09.2017	234–235, 239
<i>Sharifi and others v. Italy and Greece</i> , no. 16643/09, 21.10.2014	51
<i>Stjerna v. Finland</i> , no. 18131/91, 25.11.1994	23
<i>Streletz, Kessler and Krenz v. Germany</i> [GC], nos. 34044/96, 35532/97 and 44801/98, 22.03.2001	176
<i>Tarakhel v. Switzerland</i> [GC], no. 29217/12, 14.11.2014	50–51, 69
<i>Vallianatos and Others v. Greece</i> [GC], nos. 29381/09 and 32684/09, ECHR 2013-VI	93, 172
<i>Wagner and J.M.W.L. v. Luxembourg</i> , no. 76240/01, ECHR 2007-VII	23, 91, 94, 167, 173, 216–217, 219
<i>X and others v. Austria</i> [GC], no. 19010/07, ECHR 2013-II	72, 180–181
<i>X, Y and Z v. United Kingdom</i> , no. 21830/93, 22.04.1997	228
<i>X. v Latvia</i> [GC], no. 27853/09, ECHR 2013-VI	168, 245
<i>X. v. Germany</i> , no. 6167/73, 18.12.1974	129
<i>Z.H. and R.H. v. Switzerland</i> , no. 60119/12, 08.12.2015	116, 128–130, 132

LIST OF AUTHORS

Roberto Baratta

Professor of International Law and European Union Law at the University of Macerata, Italy

Elisabetta Bergamini

Professor of International Law at the University of Udine, Italy

Laura Carpenato

Associate Professor of European Union Law at the University of Genoa, Italy

Francesco Deana

Lecturer in European Union Law at the University of Udine, Italy

Sara De Vido

Researcher of International Law at the Ca' Foscari University of Venice, Italy

Marcella Distefano

Professor of International Law at the University of Messina, Italy

Pietro Franzina

Professor of International Law at the University of Ferrara, Italy

Costanza Honorati

Professor of European Union Law at the University of Milano-Bicocca, Italy

Ruth Lamont

Senior Lecturer in Family and Child Law at the University of Manchester, United Kingdom

Alessandra Lang

Professor of European Union Law at the University of Milan, Italy

Maura Marchegiani

Professor of International Law at the University of Foreigners of Perugia, Italy

Chiara Ragni

Professor of International Law at the University of Milan, Italy

Peter Rodrigues

Professor of Immigration Law and Chair of the Institute of Immigration Law at Leiden University, The Netherlands

Lidia Sandrini

Professor of International Law at the University of Milan, Italy

Katarina Trimmings

Senior Lecturer in Private International Law at the University of Aberdeen,
United Kingdom

Alina Tryfodinou

Professor of Law at the University of Reading, United Kingdom