



**NEMIS**

Quarterly update on

- *Legislation and*
  - *Jurisprudence*
- on
- *EU Migration and*
  - *Borders Law*

Editorial Board

- Elspeth Guild*  
*Carolus Grütters*  
*Steve Peers*  
*Tineke Strik*  
*Jens Vedsted-Hansen*

*Published by the Centre for Migration Law (CMR), Radboud University Nijmegen (NL)  
 in close co-operation with  
 University of Essex (UK) and Aarhus University (DK)*

**Contents**

	Editorial	2
1.	Regular Migration	
	1.1 Adopted Measures	3
	1.2 Proposed Measures	5
	1.3 Jurisprudence	
	1.3.1 CJEU	5
	1.3.2 CJEU pending	7
	1.3.3 EFTA	8
	1.3.4 ECtHR	8
	1.3.5 national judgments	10
2.	Borders and Visas	
	2.1 Adopted Measures	13
	2.2 Proposed Measures	15
	2.3 Jurisprudence	
	2.3.1 CJEU	16
	2.3.2 CJEU pending	18
	2.3.3 ECtHR	19
	2.3.4 national judgments	19
3.	Irregular Migration	
	3.1 Adopted Measures	20
	3.2 Proposed Measures	22
	3.3 Jurisprudence	
	3.3.1 CJEU	22
	3.3.2 CJEU pending	23
	3.3.3 ECtHR	24
	3.3.4 national judgments	25
4.	External Treaties	
	4.1 Association Agreements	25
	4.2 Readmission	27
	4.3 Other	27
	4.4 Jurisprudence	
	4.4.1 CJEU EEC-Turkey Ass	28
	4.4.2 CJEU pending	32
	4.4.3 national judgments	32
5.	Miscellaneous	33

## Editorial

**Welcome** to the third edition of NEMIS in 2014.

### Family Reunification

The CJEU ruled in *Dogan* (C-138/13) that (German) integration or language requirements imposed on Turkish nationals who wish to enter the EU for the purposes of family reunification are not in compliance with the standstill provision in art. 41(1) of the Additional Protocol of the EEC-Turkey Association Agreement. Although the Court was asked, it did not answer - yet - the question whether these requirements would also not be in compliance with the Family Reunification Directive. Probably, the court will answer this second question in the (pending) case *K&A* (C-153/14). However, § 38 of the judgment could also have implications for its forthcoming answer on the compatibility of the language test with the Family Reunification: “on the assumption that the grounds set out by the German Government, namely the prevention of forced marriages and the promotion of integration, can constitute overriding reasons in the public interest, it remains the case that a national provision such as that at issue in the main proceedings goes beyond what is necessary in order to attain the objective pursued, in so far as the absence of evidence of sufficient linguistic knowledge automatically leads to the dismissal of the application for family reunification, without account being taken of the specific circumstances of each case”.

The ECtHR ruled early this year in *Biao* (25 March 2014) that the so-called Danish “attachment requirement” was not a violation of art. 8 ECHR. That judgment raised more questions than it answered. Meanwhile, a request has been made (on 9 August 2014) for referral of this case to the Grand Chamber. A second interesting judgment of the ECtHR concerning art. 8 ECHR, is the *Kaplan v Norway* case (24 July 2014). Norway expels the father after eight years of inactivity of the authorities, leaving his (naturalised) wife and children behind. Notwithstanding the fact that this case was about a violation of art. 8 ECHR, the Court made (again) an explicit reference to the International Convention on the Rights of the Child stating: “it is not convinced in the concrete and exceptional circumstance of the case that sufficient weight was attached to the best interests of the child.”

### Students

After two judgments on students that were primarily controlled by the EEC-Turkey Association Agreement (*Payir* in 2008 and *Sommer* in 2012) the CJEU finally interpreted the Students Directive. In *Ben Alaya* (C-491/13) the CJEU rules that if the conditions (of the directive) are met a student visa has to be provided. There is - in such cases - no room for discretionary powers.

### Visa and Borders

In the *Air Baltic* case (4 Sep. 2014) the CJEU answered several questions. First, the Court ruled in the context of the Visa Code, that the validity of a visa is not depending on the physical ‘carrier’, i.e. the passport, of the visa. The second question concerns the Borders Code. The CJEU ruled that there are only a limited number of grounds on which TCNs can be refused entry at the border of a MS.

### Due process

The ECtHR reproved in *Dhahbi* (17120/09, 8 Apr. 2014) the Italian Supreme Court because it failed to address an issue on the interpretation of Union Law. According to art. 6 ECHR a national judge has an obligation to answer a question that explicitly invokes a preliminary question to the CJEU on the interpretation of Union law. The Italian court did not answer the question at all, which urged the ECtHR to decide that the Italian Supreme Court was breaking Union Law.

Nijmegen September 2014, Carolus Grütters & Tineke Strik

Website <http://cmr.jur.ru.nl/nemis>

Subscribe email to [c.grutters@jur.ru.nl](mailto:c.grutters@jur.ru.nl)

ISSN 2212 - 9154

## About

NEMIS is a newsletter designed for judges who need to keep up to date with EU developments in migration and borders law. This newsletter contains all European legislation and jurisprudence on access and residence rights of third country nationals, as well as relevant national judgments on the interpretation of this legislation. NEMIS does not include jurisprudence on free movement or asylum. We would like to refer to a separate Newsletter on that issue, the Newsletter on European Asylum Issues ([NEAIS](#)).

## 1 Regular Migration

### 1.1 Regular Migration: Adopted Measures

#### Directive 2009/50

*On conditions of entry and residence of TCNs for the purposes of highly qualified employment*

\* OJ 2009 L 155/17

#### Blue Card

impl. date 19 June 2011

#### Directive 2003/86

*On the right to Family Reunification*

\* OJ 2003 L 251/12

\* COM(2014) 210, 3 Apr. 2014: Guidelines on the application

#### Family Reunification

impl. date 3 Oct. 2005

#### *CJEU judgments*

**New** ☞ CJEU C-338/13 *Noorzia*

17 July 2014 Art. 4(5)

**New** ☞ CJEU C-138/13 *Dogan (Naime)*

10 July 2014 Art. 7(2)

☞ CJEU C-87/12 *Ymeraga*

8 May 2013 Art. 3(3)

☞ CJEU C-356/11 *O. and S.*

6 Dec. 2012 Art. 7(1)(c)

☞ CJEU C-155/11 *Imran*

10 June 2011 Art. 7(2) - no adj.

☞ CJEU C-578/08 *Chakroun*

4 Mar. 2010 Art. 7(1)(c) + 2(d)

☞ CJEU C-540/03 *EP v Council*

27 June 2006 Art. 8

#### *CJEU pending cases*

**New** ☞ CJEU C-153/14 *K. & A.*

pending Art. 7(2)

#### *EFTA judgments*

☞ EFTA E-4/11 *Clauder*

26 July 2011 Art. 7(1)

#### *National Judgments*

☞ Irl: *Casha Digale* [2013] IEHC 25

22 Jan. 2013 Art. 4+10

☞ Ger: BVerwG 10 C 4.12

29 Dec. 2012 Art. 17

☞ NL: Rb Den Haag zp Den Bosch AWB 12/9408

23 Nov. 2012 Art. 7(2)

☞ Ger: VerwG Berlin VG 29 K 138.12V

25 Oct. 2012 Art. 7(2)

☞ NL: Raad van State 201008782/1/V1

9 Oct. 2012

☞ Ger: BVerwG 10 C 12.12

4 Sep. 2012 Art. 8

☞ Ger: BVerwG 1 C 9.10

28 Oct. 2011

☞ Ger: BVerwG 1 C 8.09

30 Mar. 2010 Art. 7(2)

See further: § 1.3

#### Council Decision 2007/435

*Establishing European Fund for the Integration of TCNs for the period 2007 to 2013 as part of the General programme Solidarity and Management of Migration Flows*

\* OJ 2007 L 168/18

UK, IRL opt in

#### Integration Fund

**New**

#### Directive 2014/66

*On conditions of entry and residence of TCNs in the framework of an intra-corporate transfer*

\* OJ 2014 L 157/1

#### Intra-Corporate Transferees

impl. date 29 Nov. 2016

#### Directive 2003/109

*Concerning the status of TCNs who are long-term residents*

\* OJ 2004 L 16/44

\* amended by Dir. 2011/51

#### Long-Term Resident

impl. date 23 Jan. 2006

#### *CJEU judgments*

**New** ☞ CJEU C-469/13 *Tahir*

17 July 2014 Art. 7(1) + 13

☞ CJEU C-257/13 *Mlalali*

14 Nov. 2013 Art. 11(1)(d) - inadmissible

☞ CJEU C-40/11 *Iida*

8 Nov. 2012 Art. 7(1)

☞ CJEU C-502/10 *Singh*

18 Oct. 2012 Art. 3(2)(e)

☞ CJEU C-508/10 *Comm. v Netherlands*

26 Apr. 2012

☞ CJEU C-571/10 *Servet Kamberaj*

24 Apr. 2012 Art. 11(1)(d)

#### *CJEU pending cases*

**New** ☞ CJEU C-176/14 *Van Hauthem*

pending Art. 14

**New** ☞ CJEU C-309/14 *CGIL*

pending

☞ CJEU C-579/13 *P. and S.*

pending Art. 5 + 11

*National Judgments*

☞ NL: Raad van State 201401261/1/V1 17 June 2014  
See further: § 1.3

**Directive 2011/51**

*Long-Term Resident status for refugees and persons with subsidiary protection*

\* OJ 2011 L 132/1 (April 2011) impl. date 20 May 2013  
\* extending Dir. 2003/109 on LTR

**Long-Term Resident ext.**

**Council Decision 2006/688**

*On the establishment of a mutual information mechanism in the areas of asylum and immigration*

\* OJ 2006 L 283/40 UK, IRL opt in

**Mutual Information**

**Directive 2005/71**

*On a specific procedure for admitting TCNs for the purposes of scientific research*

\* OJ 2005 L 289/15 impl. date 12 Oct. 2007

**Researchers**

*CJEU judgments*

☞ CJEU C-523/08 *Comm. v Spain* 11 Feb. 2010  
See further: § 1.3

**Recommendation 762/2005**

*To facilitate the admission of TCNs to carry out scientific research*

\* OJ 2005 L 289/26

**Researchers**

**Regulation 1030/2002**

*Laying down a uniform format for residence permits for TCNs*

\* OJ 2002 L 157/1 UK opt in  
amd by Reg. 330/2008 (OJ 2008 L 115/1)

**Residence Permit Format**

**Directive 2014/36**

*On the conditions of entry and residence of TCNs for the purposes of seasonal employment*

\* OJ 2014 L 94/375 impl. date 30 Sep. 2016

**Seasonal Workers**

**Directive 2011/98**

*Single Application Procedure: for a single permit for TCNs to reside and work in the territory of a MS and on a common set of rights for third-country workers legally residing in a MS*

\* OJ 2011 L 343/1 (Dec. 2011) impl. date 25 Dec. 2013

**Single Permit**

**Regulation 859/2003**

*Third-Country Nationals' Social Security extending Reg. 1408/71 and Reg. 574/72*

\* OJ 2003 L 124/1 UK, IRL opt in

**Social Security TCN**

**Regulation 1231/2010**

*Social Security for EU Citizens and TCNs who move within the EU*

\* OJ 2010 L 344/1 impl. date 1 Jan. 2011 IRL opt in; UK opt out  
\* Replacing Reg. 859/2003 on Social Security TCN

**Social Security TCN II**

**Directive 2004/114**

*Admission of Third-Country Nationals for the purposes of studies, pupil exchange, unremunerated training or voluntary service*

\* OJ 2004 L 375/12 impl. date 12 Jan. 2007

**Students**

*CJEU judgments*

**New** ☞ CJEU C-491/13 *Ben Alaya* 10 Sep. 2014 Art. 6 + 7  
☞ CJEU C-15/11 *Sommer* 21 June 2012 Art. 17(3)  
☞ CJEU C-568/10 *Comm. v Austria* 22 Nov. 2011 Art. 17(1) - deleted  
☞ CJEU C-294/06 *Payir* 24 Nov. 2008  
See further: § 1.3

**ECHR**

**Family - Marriage - Discrimination**

*European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms and its Protocols*

Art. 8 Family Life  
Art. 12 Right to Marry

1.1: Regular Migration: Adopted Measures

Art. 14 Prohibition of Discrimination

\* ETS 005 (4-11-50) impl. date 31 Aug.1954

*ECtHR Judgments*

<b>New</b>	☞ ECtHR Ap.no. 32504/11 <i>Kaplan a.o. v NO</i>	24 July	2014	Art. 8
<b>New</b>	☞ ECtHR Ap.no. 52701/09 <i>Mugenzi v FR</i>	10 July	2014	Art. 8
	☞ ECtHR Ap.no. 38590/10 <i>Biao</i>	25 Mar.	2014	Art. 8
	☞ ECtHR Ap.no. 52166/09 <i>Hasanbasic v CH</i>	11 June	2013	Art. 8
	☞ ECtHR Ap.no. 12020/09 <i>Udeh v CH</i>	16 Apr.	2013	Art. 8
	☞ ECtHR Ap.no. 22689/07 <i>De Souza Ribeiro v UK</i>	13 Dec.	2012	Art. 8 + 13
	☞ ECtHR Ap.no. 22341/09 <i>Hode and Abdi v UK</i>	6 Nov.	2012	Art. 8 + 14
	☞ ECtHR Ap.no. 22251/07 <i>G.R. v NL</i>	10 Jan.	2012	Art. 8 + 13
	☞ ECtHR Ap.no. 8000/08 <i>A.A. v UK</i>	20 Sep.	2011	Art. 8
	☞ ECtHR Ap.no. 55597/09 <i>Nunez v NO</i>	28 June	2011	Art. 8
	☞ ECtHR Ap.no. 38058/09 <i>Osman v DK</i>	14 June	2011	Art. 8
	☞ ECtHR Ap.no. 34848/07 <i>O'Donoghue v UK</i>	14 Dec.	2010	Art. 12 + 14

*National Judgments*

☞ UK: Quila SC [2011]UKSC45	12 Oct.	2011	Art. 8
☞ UK: MH Morocco [2010] UKUT 439 IAC	28 Sep.	2010	Art. 8

See further: § 1.3

1.2 Regular Migration: Proposed Measures

**Directive**

**Researchers and Students (recast)**

*On the conditions of entry and residence of Third-Country Nationals for the purposes of research, studies, pupil exchange, remunerated and unremunerated training, voluntary service and au pairing.*

- \* COM (2013) 151, 25 March 2013
- \* This directive will replace both Dir 2005/71 on Researchers and Dir 2004/114 on Students
- EP plenary vote Mar. 2014

1.3 Regular Migration: Jurisprudence

**1.3.1 CJEU Judgments on Regular Migration**

- New** ☞ CJEU C-491/13 *Ben Alaya* [10 Sep. 2014]
- \* interpr. of Dir. 2004/114 **Students** [Art. 6 + 7]
- \* *The MS concerned is obliged to admit to its territory a third-country national who wishes to stay for more than three months in that territory for study purposes, where that national meets the conditions for admission exhaustively listed in Art. 6 and 7 and provided that that MS does not invoke against that person one of the grounds expressly listed by the directive as justification for refusing a residence permit.*
- ☞ CJEU C-578/08 *Chakroun* [4 Mar. 2010]
- \* interpr. of Dir. 2003/86 **Family Reunification** [Art. 7(1)(c) + 2(d)]
- \* *The concept of family reunification allows no distinction based on the time of marriage. Furthermore, Member States may not require an income as a condition for family reunification, which is higher than the national minimum wage level. Admission conditions allowed by the directive, serve as indicators, but should not be applied rigidly, i.e. all individual circumstances should be taken into account.*
- ☞ CJEU C-568/10 *Comm. v Austria* [22 Nov. 2011] (deleted)
- \* incor. appl. of Dir. 2004/114 **Students** [Art. 17(1) - deleted]
- \* *Austrian law systematically denies TCN students access to the labour market. They are issued a work permit for a vacant position only if a check has been previously carried out as to whether the position cannot be filled by a person registered as unemployed.*
- ☞ CJEU C-508/10 *Comm. v Netherlands* [26 Apr. 2012]
- \* incor. appl. of Dir. 2003/109 **Long-Term Resident**
- \* *The Court rules that the Netherlands has failed to fulfil its obligations by applying excessive and disproportionate administrative fees which are liable to create an obstacle to the exercise of the rights conferred by the Long-Term Residents Directive: (1) to TCNs seeking long-term resident*

*status in the Netherlands, (2) to those who, having acquired that status in a MS other than the Kingdom of the Netherlands, are seeking to exercise the right to reside in that MS, and (3) to members of their families seeking authorisation to accompany or join them.*

☞ CJEU C-523/08 **Comm. v Spain** [11 Feb. 2010]

\* non-transp. of Dir. 2005/71 **Researchers**

**New**

☞ CJEU C-138/13 **Dogan (Naime)** [10 July 2014]

\* interpr. of Dir. 2003/86 **Family Reunification** [Art. 7(2)]

\* *The language requirement abroad is not in compliance with the standstill clauses of the Association Agreement. Although the question was also raised whether this requirement is in compliance with the Family Reunification Directive, the Court did not answer that question.*

*However, paragraph 38 of the judgment could also have implications for its forthcoming answer on the compatibility of the language test with the Family Reunification: “on the assumption that the grounds set out by the German Government, namely the prevention of forced marriages and the promotion of integration, can constitute overriding reasons in the public interest, it remains the case that a national provision such as that at issue in the main proceedings goes beyond what is necessary in order to attain the objective pursued, in so far as the absence of evidence of sufficient linguistic knowledge automatically leads to the dismissal of the application for family reunification, without account being taken of the specific circumstances of each case”.*

*In this context it is relevant that the European Commission has stressed in its Communication on guidance for the application of Dir 2003/86, “that the objective of such measures is to facilitate the integration of family members. Their admissibility depends on whether they serve this purpose and whether they respect the principle of proportionality” (COM (2014)210, § 4.5).*

☞ CJEU C-540/03 **EP v Council** [27 June 2006]

\* interpr. of Dir. 2003/86 **Family Reunification** [Art. 8]

\* *The derogation clauses (3 years waiting period and the age-limits for children) are not annulled, as they do not constitute a violation of article 8 ECHR. However, while applying these clauses and the directive as a whole, Member States are bound by the fundamental rights (including the rights of the child), the purpose of the directive and obligation to take all individual interests into account.*

☞ CJEU C-40/11 **Iida** [8 Nov. 2012]

\* interpr. of Dir. 2003/109 **Long-Term Resident** [Art. 7(1)]

\* *In order to acquire long-term resident status, the third-country national concerned must lodge an application with the competent authorities of the Member State in which he resides. If this application is voluntarily withdrawn, a residence permit can not be granted.*

☞ CJEU C-155/11 **Imran** [10 June 2011] (no adj.)

\* interpr. of Dir. 2003/86 **Family Reunification** [Art. 7(2) - no adj.]

\* *The Commission took the position that Art. 7(2) does not allow Member States to deny a family member as meant in Art. 4(1)(a) of a lawfully residing TCN entry and admission on the sole ground of not having passed a civic integration examination abroad.*

*See: <http://cmr.jur.ru.nl/nemis/Imran.EU.pdf>*

*However, as a residence permit was granted just before the hearing would take place, the Court decided it was not necessary to give a ruling.*

☞ CJEU C-257/13 **Mlalali** [14 Nov. 2013] (inadmissible)

\* interpr. of Dir. 2003/109 **Long-Term Resident** [Art. 11(1)(d) - inadmissible]

\* *Case (on equal treatment) was inadmissible*

**New**

☞ CJEU C-338/13 **Noorzia** [17 July 2014]

\* interpr. of Dir. 2003/86 **Family Reunification** [Art. 4(5)]

\* *Art. 4(5) does not preclude a rule of national law requiring that spouses and registered partners must have reached the age of 21 by the date when the application seeking to be considered family members entitled to reunification is lodged.*

☞ CJEU C-356/11 **O. and S.** [6 Dec. 2012]

\* interpr. of Dir. 2003/86 **Family Reunification** [Art. 7(1)(c)]

\* *When examining an application for family reunification, a MS has to do so in the interests of the children concerned and also with a view to promoting family life, and avoiding any undermining of the objective and the effectiveness of the directive.*

- ☞ CJEU C-294/06 **Payir** [24 Nov. 2008]
  - \* interpr. of Dir. 2004/114 **Students**
  - \* *On a working Turkish student.*
- ☞ CJEU C-571/10 **Servet Kamberaj** [24 Apr. 2012]
  - \* interpr. of Dir. 2003/109 **Long-Term Resident** [Art. 11(1)(d)]
  - \* *EU Law precludes a distinction on the basis of ethnicity or linguistic groups in order to be eligible for housing benefit.*
- ☞ CJEU C-502/10 **Singh** [18 Oct. 2012]
  - \* interpr. of Dir. 2003/109 **Long-Term Resident** [Art. 3(2)(e)]
  - \* *The concept of 'residence permit which has been formally limited' as referred to in Art. 3(2)(e), does not include a fixed-period residence permit, granted to a specific group of persons, if the validity of their permit can be extended indefinitely without offering the prospect of permanent residence rights. The referring national court has to ascertain if a formal limitation does not prevent the long-term residence of the third-country national in the Member State concerned. If that is the case, this national cannot be excluded from the personal scope of Directive 2003/109.*
- ☞ CJEU C-15/11 **Sommer** [21 June 2012]
  - \* interpr. of Dir. 2004/114 **Students** [Art. 17(3)]
  - \* *The conditions of access to the labour market by Bulgarian students, may not be more restrictive than those set out in the Directive*
- New** ☞ CJEU C-469/13 **Tahir** [17 July 2014]
  - \* interpr. of Dir. 2003/109 **Long-Term Resident** [Art. 7(1) + 13]
  - \* *Family members of a person who has already acquired LTR status may not be exempted from the condition laid down in Article 4(1), under which, in order to obtain that status, a TCN must have resided legally and continuously in the MS concerned for five years immediately prior to the submission of the relevant application.*
  - Art. 13 of Dir. 2003/109, as amended by Dir. 2011/51, does not allow a MS to issue family members, as defined in Article 2(e) of that directive, with LTR' EU residence permits on terms more favourable than those laid down by that directive.*
- ☞ CJEU C-247/09 **Xhymshiti** [18 Nov. 2010]
  - \* interpr. of Reg. 859/2003 **Social Security TCNs**
- ☞ CJEU C-87/12 **Ymeraga** [8 May 2013]
  - \* interpr. of Dir. 2003/86 **Family Reunification** [Art. 3(3)]
  - \* *Directives 2003/86 and 2004/38 are not applicable to third-country nationals who apply for the right of residence in order to join a family member who is a Union citizen and has never exercised his right of freedom of movement as a Union citizen, always having resided as such in the Member State of which he holds the nationality (see, also, C-256/11 Dereci a.o., par. 58).*

### 1.3.2 CJEU pending cases on Regular Migration

- New** ☞ CJEU C-309/14 **CGIL**
  - \* interpr. of Dir. 2003/109 **Long-Term Resident**
  - \* ref. from 'Tribunale Amministrativo Regionale per il Lazio' (Italy) 17-12-2013
  - \* *Italian national legislation has set a minimum fee for a residence permit, which is around eight times the charge for the issue of a national identity card. Is such national legislation in conflict with the LTR directive?*
- New** ☞ CJEU C-153/14 **K. & A.**
  - \* interpr. of Dir. 2003/86 **Family Reunification** [Art. 7(2)]
  - \* ref. from 'Raad van State' (Netherlands) 03-04-2014
  - \* *On the acceptability of integration test abroad.*
- ☞ CJEU C-579/13 **P. and S.**
  - \* interpr. of Dir. 2003/109 **Long-Term Resident** [Art. 5 + 11]
  - \* ref. from 'Centrale Raad van Beroep' (Netherlands)
  - \* *The Dutch Centrale Raad van Beroep has asked the CJEU whether art. 5 and 11 allow Member States to impose an obligation to integrate (sanctioned by a fine) on a holder of the Long-term*

*resident status. Furthermore, the Council wants to know if it is relevant in this regard that the obligation has been imposed already before the person had acquired the Long-term resident status.*

**New**

- ☞ CJEU C-176/14 **Van Hauthem**
- \* interpr. of Dir. 2003/109 **Long-Term Resident** [Art. 14]
- \* *in the absence of a specific exclusion of an economic activity on the basis of Article 14(3), a long-term resident of another Member State will gain unlimited access to the Belgian labour market, including to positions which, on the basis of Article 11(1)(a) or Article 11(3)(a) of Directive 2003/109/EC, could be denied to long-term residents of Belgium, or to positions from which EEA nationals could also be excluded pursuant to Article 45(4) TFEU or Article 28(4) of the EEA Agreement?*

### 1.3.3 EFTA judgments on Regular Migration

- ☞ EFTA E-4/11 **Clauder** [26 July 2011]
- \* interpr. of Dir. 2003/86 **Family Reunification** [Art. 7(1)]
- \* ref. from 'Verwaltungsgerichtshof (Liechtenstein)
- \* *An EEA national with a right of permanent residence, who is a pensioner and in receipt of social welfare benefits in the host EEA State, may claim the right to family reunification even if the family member will also be claiming social welfare benefits.*

### 1.3.4 ECtHR Judgments on Regular Migration

- ☞ ECtHR Ap.no. 8000/08 **A.A. v UK** [20 Sep. 2011]
- \* violation of **ECHR** [Art. 8]
- \* *The applicant alleged, in particular, that his deportation to Nigeria would violate his right to respect for his family and private life and would deprive him of the right to education by terminating his university studies in the United Kingdom.*
- ☞ ECtHR Ap.no. 38590/10 **Biao** [25 Mar. 2014]
- \* no violation of **ECHR** [Art. 8]
- \* **Request for referral to the Grand Chamber on 9 Aug. 2014**
- \* *The Danish “attachement requirement” does not violate art. 8 or art. 14 ECHR.*
- ☞ ECtHR Ap.no. 22689/07 **De Souza Ribeiro v UK** [13 Dec. 2012]
- \* violation of **ECHR** [Art. 8 + 13]
- \* *A Brazilian in French Guiana was removed to Brazil within 50 minutes after an appeal had been lodged against his removal order. In this case the Court considers that the haste with which the removal order was executed had the effect of rendering the available remedies ineffective in practice and therefore inaccessible. The brevity of that time lapse excludes any possibility that the court seriously examined the circumstances and legal arguments in favour of or against a violation of Article 8 of the Convention in the event of the removal order being enforced. Thus, while States are afforded some discretion as to the manner in which they conform to their obligations under Article 13 of the Convention, that discretion must not result, as in the present case, in an applicant being denied access in practice to the minimum procedural safeguards needed to protect him against arbitrary expulsion. Concerning the danger of overloading the courts and adversely affecting the proper administration of justice in French Guiana, the Court reiterates that, as with Article 6 of the Convention, Article 13 imposes on the Contracting States the duty to organise their judicial systems in such a way that their courts can meet its requirements.*

**New**

- ☞ ECtHR Ap.no. 17120/09 **Dhahbi v IT** [8 Apr. 2014]
- \* interpr. of **ECHR** [Art. 6, 8 and 14]
- \* *The ECtHR ruled that art. 6(1) also means that a national judge has an obligation to decide on a question which requests for a preliminary ruling on the interpretation of Union law. Either the national judge explicitly argues why such a request is pointless (or already answered) or the national judge requests the CJEU for a preliminary ruling on the issue. In this case the Italian Supreme Court did not answer the question at all.*
- ☞ ECtHR Ap.no. 22251/07 **G.R. v NL** [10 Jan. 2012]
- \* violation of **ECHR** [Art. 8 + 13]
- \* *The applicant did not have effective access to the administrative procedure by which he might, subject to fulfilling the conditions prescribed by domestic law, obtain a residence permit which*



would allow him to reside lawfully with his family in the Netherlands, due to the disproportion between the administrative charge in issue and the actual income of the applicant's family. The Court finds that the extremely formalistic attitude of the Minister – which, endorsed by the Regional Court, also deprived the applicant of access to the competent administrative tribunal – unjustifiably hindered the applicant's use of an otherwise effective domestic remedy.

*There has therefore been a violation of Article 8 and 13 of the Convention.*

☞ ECtHR Ap.no. 52166/09 *Hasanbasic v CH* [11 June 2013]

\* violation of **ECHR** [Art. 8]

\* *After living in Switzerland for 23 years with a residence permit, the applicant decides to go back to Bosnia. Soon after, he gets seriously ill and wants to get back to his wife who stayed in Switzerland. However, this (family reunification) request is denied mainly because of the fact that he has been on welfare and had been fined (a total of 350 euros) and convicted for several offences (a total of 17 days imprisonment). The court rules that this rejection, given the circumstances of the case, is disproportionate and a violation of article 8.*

☞ ECtHR Ap.no. 22341/09 *Hode and Abdi v UK* [6 Nov. 2012]

\* violation of **ECHR** [Art. 8 + 14]

\* *Discrimination on the basis of date of marriage has no objective and reasonable justification.*

**New**

☞ ECtHR Ap.no. 32504/11 *Kaplan a.o. v NO* [24 July 2014]

\* violation of **ECHR** [Art. 8]

\* explicit reference to the Best interests of the Child

\* *A Turkish father's application for asylum is denied in 1998. After a conviction for aggravated burglary in 1999 he gets an expulsion order and an indefinite entry ban. On appeal this entry ban is reduced to 5 years. Finally he is expelled in 2011. His wife and children arrived in Norway in 2003 and were granted citizenship in 2012. Given the youngest daughter special care needs (related to chronic and serious autism), the bond with the father and the long period of inactivity of the immigration authorities, the Court states that it is not convinced in the concrete and exceptional circumstance of the case that sufficient weight was attached to the best interests of the child.*

**New**

☞ ECtHR Ap.no. 52701/09 *Mugenzi v FR* [10 July 2014]

\* violation of **ECHR** [Art. 8]

\* *The Court noted the particular difficulties the applicant encountered in their applications, namely the excessive delays and lack of reasons or explanations given throughout the process, despite the fact that he had already been through traumatic experiences.*

☞ ECtHR Ap.no. 55597/09 *Nunez v NO* [28 June 2011]

\* violation of **ECHR** [Art. 8]

\* *Although Ms Nunez was deported from Norway in 1996 with a two-year ban on her re-entry into Norway, she returned to Norway, got married and had two daughters born in 2002 and 2003. It takes until 2005 for the Norwegian authorities to revoke her permits and to decide that Mrs Nunez should be expelled.*

*The Court rules that the authorities had not struck a fair balance between the public interest in ensuring effective immigration control and Ms Nunez's need to remain in Norway in order to continue to have contact with her children.*

☞ ECtHR Ap.no. 34848/07 *O'Donoghue v UK* [14 Dec. 2010]

\* violation of **ECHR** [Art. 12 + 14]

\* Judgment of Fourth Section

\* *The UK Certificate of Approval required foreigners, except those wishing to marry in the Church of England, to pay large fees to obtain the permission from the Home Office to marry. The Court found that the conditions violated the right to marry (Article 12 of the Convention), that it was discriminatory in its application (Article 14 of the Convention) and that it was discriminatory on the ground of religion (Articles 9 and 14 of the Convention).*

☞ ECtHR Ap.no. 38058/09 *Osman v DK* [14 June 2011]

\* violation of **ECHR** [Art. 8]

\* *The Court concluded that the denial of admission of a 17 years old Somali girl to Denmark, where she had lived from the age of seven until the age of fifteen, violated Article 8. For a settled migrant who has lawfully spent all of the major part of his or her childhood and youth in a host country, very serious reasons are required to justify expulsion'. The Danish Government had argued that the*

refusal was justified because the applicant had been taken out of the country by her father, with her mother's permission, in exercise of their rights of parental responsibility. The Court agreed 'that the exercise of parental rights constitutes a fundamental element of family life', but concluded that 'in respecting parental rights, the authorities cannot ignore the child's interest including its own right to respect for private and family life'.

☞ ECtHR Ap.no. 12020/09 *Udeh v CH* [16 Apr. 2013]

\* violation of ECHR [Art. 8]

\* In 2001 a Nigerian national, was sentenced to four months' imprisonment for possession of a small quantity of cocaine. In 2003 he married a Swiss national who had just given birth to their twin daughters. By virtue of his marriage, he was granted a residence permit in Switzerland. In 2006 he was sentenced to forty-two months' imprisonment in Germany for a drug-trafficking offence. The Swiss Office of Migration refused to renew his residence permit, stating that his criminal conviction and his family's dependence on welfare benefits were grounds for his expulsion. An appeal was dismissed. In 2009 he was informed that he had to leave Switzerland. In 2011 he was made the subject of an order prohibiting him from entering Switzerland until 2020. Although he is divorced in the meantime and custody of the children has been awarded to the mother, he has been given contact rights. The court rules that deportation and exclusion orders would prevent the immigrant with two criminal convictions from seeing his minor children: deportation would constitute a violation of article 8.

### 1.3.5 National Judgments on Regular Migration

☞ **Germany:** BVerwG 10 C 4.12 [29 Dec. 2012]

\* interpretation of Dir. 2003/86: *Family Reunification* Art. 17

\* In a family reunification case, the Federal Administrative Court decided that, following the Chakroun judgment of the CJEU, the level of income that can be required from the sponsor, also depends on the actual needs of the family as a whole. If the necessary income level is not fully ensured, Article 17 of the Family Reunification Directive requires a further individual assessment if there are reasons to derogate from the formal income requirement. This assessment is in any case subject of a full judicial scrutiny.

☞ **Germany:** VerwG Berlin VG 29 K 138.12V [25 Oct. 2012]

\* interpretation of Dir. 2003/86: *Family Reunification* Art. 7(2)

\* The Verwaltungsgericht (Administrative Court) of Berlin asked, first, whether passing the language test as a condition for family reunification was in compliance with the standstill clauses in the EEC-Turkey Association law and, second, whether it was in compliance with Article 7(2) of the Family Reunification Directive.

☞ **Germany:** BVerwG 10 C 12.12 [4 Sep. 2012]

\* interpretation of Dir. 2003/86: *Family Reunification* Art. 8

\* appeal from VG Berlin, 1 Aug. 2011, VG 22 K 340.09 V

\* <http://cmr.jur.ru.nl/nemis/Germany/BVerwG10C1212.pdf>

\* The German pre-entry language requirement is in compliance with art. 6 German Constitution and art. 8 ECHR, as long as the measure is proportional in the individual case. In case of a third country national with a German partner, this principle of proportionality is violated earlier than in case of both partners being third country nationals, because the German Constitution guarantees the right to residence to German citizens. Even if the German has also the Afghan nationality he can't be expected to live with his family life outside Germany. Therefore the spouse may enter Germany even without passing the language test if he or she has shown efforts to learn the language, but has not succeeded within a year's time. This period of one year does not need to be fulfilled if there are no courses (or alternatives) available or if participation in a course implies a high security risk. A German citizen who did not use the EU right to free movement, cannot rely on art. 9 Charter of Fundamental Rights, as Union law is not applicable. In this regard the court refers to art. 3(3) Dir. 2003/86, which excludes Union citizens. According to the court, this explicit exclusion in the directive justifies a different interpretation of the personal scope than the scope of Decision 1/80, as interpreted by the CJEU in the case Kahveci and Inan (C-7/10 and C-9/10).

☞ **Germany:** BVerwG 1 C 9.10 [28 Oct. 2011]

\* interpretation of Dir. 2003/86: *Family Reunification*

- \* appeal from Berlin-Brandenburg Higher Administrative Court, 25 Mar. 2010
- \* <http://cmr.jur.ru.nl/nemis/Germany/BVerwG1C910.pdf>
- \* *Regarding the position of the European Commission taken in the case Imran (see CJEU 155/11 in the previous section) that a certain language level as a condition for admission is not in compliance with the directive, a preliminary ruling of the Court of Justice would have been necessary in this case. However it was finished by granting the claimed residence permits and the decision was only on the costs. But the importance of the decision lies in the fact that German Court - in difference from its previous judgment of 30 March 2010 (BVerwG 1 C 8.09) - now regards it necessary to make a reference to the CJEU on the question whether the language requirement is in compliance with the Family Reunification Directive.*
- ☞ **Germany:** Bundessozialgericht B 14 AS 23/10 R [19 Oct. 2010]
- \* interpretation of **European Convention on Social and Medical Assistance**
- \* <http://cmr.jur.ru.nl/nemis/Germany/BundessozialgerichtB14AS2310R.pdf>
- \* *A Frenchman lawfully residing as a 'jobseeker' in Germany was entitled to social assistance benefit (Arbeitslosengeld: similar to CJEU C-22/08 Vatsouras) during the period he retained his right as a worker on the basis of art. 7(3)(c) of the Dir. on Free Movement. The question in this case was whether he was still entitled to this benefit after these 6 months as German citizens are. Such a limitation for non-nationals is an implementation of art. 24(2) of the Dir. on Free Movement. However, the German Court decided that the European Convention on Social and Medical Assistance [1953] does not allow such a limitation.*
- ☞ **Germany:** BVerwG 1 C 8.09 [30 Mar. 2010]
- \* interpretation of Dir. 2003/86: **Family Reunification** Art. 7(2)
- interpretation of **ECHR** Art. 8
- \* appeal from Berlin Administrative Court, 17 Feb. 2009, VG 35 V 47.08
- \* <http://cmr.jur.ru.nl/nemis/Germany/BVerwG1C809.pdf>
- \* *This decision is about the validity of integration measures of family members before arrival in the host Member State. (This case involved an illiterate applicant.) See also BVerwG 1 C 9.10.*
- ☞ **Ireland:** Casha Digale [2013] IEHC 25 [22 Jan. 2013]
- \* interpretation of Dir. 2003/86: **Family Reunification** Art. 4+10
- <http://www.bailii.org/ie/cases/IEHC/2013/H25.html>
- \* *A beneficiary of refugee status sought family reunification unsuccessfully for her niece and nephew who she referred to as her own children; who had been orphaned; and whom she was not capable of formally adopting owing to the absence of available procedures in Somalia or where they were living in Ethiopia. The children had attained the age of majority after the Application had been made, but prior to a decision. The Minister refused family reunification on the basis that they were not dependent.*
- The Applicant was successful in her Judicial Review as the Court found that the Minister had erred in restricting the assessment of dependency to the narrow issue of being financially dependent. Dependency should take into account all relevant social, economic, personal, physical, emotional and cultural bonds between the refugee and family member being considered. Furthermore the Minister did not conduct a proper investigation as to what would be objectively required to amount to dependency, and appeared to carry out "no more than an arbitrary evaluation based on no identified criteria".*
- New** ☞ **Netherlands:** Raad van State 201401261/1/V1 [17 June 2014]
- \* interpretation of Dir. 2003/109: **Long-Term Resident**
- \* *The Dutch Council of State has decided that the level of fees for requiring the status of an EU Long-Term resident (€ 130), is not disproportionate for an individual applicant. However if a family, consisting of four persons, has to pay 4x € 130, the fees can constitute an obstacle to the exercise of the rights conferred by the Directive. The Council of State based its reasoning on the judgment of the CJEU (C-508/10 of April 2012), in which the Court decided that the Dutch fees were "excessive and disproportionate". The fees had been lowered since then, but the question remained if they had been lowered sufficiently. As a result of the recent Council of State's decision, the fees for minor children for acquiring an EU Long-Term residence status as well as for family reunification have been reduced to € 53.*
- ☞ **Netherlands:** Rb Den Haag zp Den Bosch AWB 12/9408 [23 Nov. 2012]

- \* interpretation of Dir. 2003/86: **Family Reunification** Art. 7(2)
- \* <http://cmr.jur.ru.nl/nemis/Netherlands/RbDenHaagzpDenBoschAWB129408.pdf>
- \* *Dutch District Court fully endorses the position of the European Commission taken in the **Imran** case (C-155/11) that the denial of family reunification for the sole reason that the applicant has failed the integration test abroad, is not in compliance with Article 7(2) of the Directive. According to this court, a request for a preliminary ruling was not necessary as the interpretation of the Commission was crystal clear.*
  
- ☞ **Netherlands:** Raad van State 201008782/1/V1 [9 Oct. 2012]
- \* violation of Dir. 2003/86: **Family Reunification**
- \* <http://cmr.jur.ru.nl/nemis/Netherlands/RaadvanState2010087821V1.pdf>
- \* *The Dutch Council of State (highest administrative court) decided that the CJEU judgment on the Dutch fees for long term residents (26 April 2012, case C-508/10, Commission against the Netherlands), which the Court considered as ‘extraordinary high’, and therefore not in compliance with (the objective of) Directive 2003/109, also has repercussions for the level of fees for family reunification. According to the Council of State, the high level can also constitute an obstacle for the exercise of the right to family reunification and therefore violate Directive 2003/86, undermining its objective.*
  
- ☞ **United Kingdom:** Quila SC [2011]UKSC45 [12 Oct. 2011]
- \* interpretation of **ECHR** Art. 8
- \* <http://cmr.jur.ru.nl/nemis/UK/QuilaSC.2011.UKSC45.pdf>
- \* *These two cases concern the application of Rule 277 of the Immigration Rules (HC 395) under which the spouse or civil partner of a British national or someone settled in the UK is prevented from entering and settling in the UK if either party is under the age of 21. A parallel rule applies to fiancés and unmarried or same-sex partners. Although it was clear that the marriage was not a forced marriage, the applicants had to leave the UK in order to have a family life. The Supreme Court held that the rule was “rationally connected to the objective of deterring forced marriages (...) but the number of forced marriages which it deters is highly debatable. What seems clear is that the number of unforced marriages which it obstructs from their intended development for up to three years vastly exceeds the number of forced marriages which it deters”. The Court concluded that the Secretary of State had failed to establish that the interference with the rights of the respondents under Article 8, which protects the right to private life, that had been caused by the rule was justified.*
  
- ☞ **United Kingdom:** ZH (Tanzania) SC [2011]UKSC4 [1 Feb. 2011]
- \* interpretation of **UN Convention on the Rights of the Child**
- \* <http://cmr.jur.ru.nl/nemis/UK/ZH.Tanzania.SC.2011.UKSC4.pdf>
- \* *The Supreme Court had to decide what the UK’s obligation to respect the best interests of the child means in the context of British national children of a foreign mother who is subject to a deportation decision. The SC finds that the children’s interest to live in their country of nationality, at least in this case, outweighs the public interest in the deportation of the mother. The SC does not refer to EU law but finds that expulsion can be contrary to the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child.*
  
- ☞ **United Kingdom:** MH Morocco [2010] UKUT 439 IAC [28 Sep. 2010]
- \* interpretation of **ECHR** Art. 8
- \* <http://cmr.jur.ru.nl/nemis/UK/MHMorocco.2010.UKUT439IAC.pdf>
- \* *A refusal to adjourn proceedings before the Tribunal may have similar consequence as a decision to remove an applicant in the process of seeking a contact order: a violation of art. 8 ECHR.*

## 2 Borders and Visas

### 2.1 Borders and Visas: Adopted Measures

<b>New</b>	<p><b>Regulation 515/2014</b> <i>Borders and Visa Fund</i> * OJ 2014 L 150/143</p>	<b>Borders and Visa Fund</b>
	<p><b>Regulation 562/2006</b> <i>Establishing a Community Code on the rules governing the movement of persons across borders</i> * OJ 2006 L 105/1 amd by Reg. 296/2008 (OJ 2008 L 97/60) amd by Reg. 81/2009 (OJ 2009 L 35/56): <i>Regarding the use of the VIS</i> amd by Reg. 610/2013 (OJ 2013 L 182/1) amd by Reg. 1051/2013 (OJ 2013 L 295/1)</p>	<b>Borders Code</b>
	<i>CJEU judgments</i>	
<b>New</b>	<p>☞ CJEU C-575/12 <i>Air Baltic</i></p> <p>☞ CJEU C-23/12 <i>Zakaria</i></p> <p>☞ CJEU C-88/12 <i>Jaoo</i></p> <p>☞ CJEU C-355/10 <i>EP v Council</i></p> <p>☞ CJEU C-278/12 (PPU) <i>Adil</i></p> <p>☞ CJEU C-606/10 <i>ANAFE</i></p> <p>☞ CJEU C-430/10 <i>Gaydarov</i></p> <p>☞ CJEU C-188/10 &amp; C-189/10 <i>Melki &amp; Abdeli</i></p> <p>☞ CJEU C-261/08 &amp; C-348/08 <i>Garcia &amp; Cabrera</i></p> <p>See further: § 2.3</p>	<p>4 Sep. 2014 Art. 5</p> <p>17 Jan. 2013 Art. 13(3)</p> <p>14 Sep. 2012 Art. 20 + 21 - deleted</p> <p>5 Sep. 2012</p> <p>19 July 2012 Art. 20 + 21</p> <p>14 June 2012 Art. 13 + 5(4)(a)</p> <p>17 Nov. 2011</p> <p>22 June 2010 Art. 20 + 21</p> <p>22 Oct. 2009 Art. 5, 11 + 13</p>
	<p><b>Decision 574/2007</b> <i>Establishing European External Borders Fund</i> * OJ 2007 L 144</p>	<b>Borders Fund</b>
	<p><b>Regulation 1052/2013</b> <i>Establishing the European Border Surveillance System (Eurosur)</i> * OJ 2013 L 295/11</p>	<b>EUROSUR</b>
	<p><b>Regulation 2007/2004</b> <i>Establishing External Borders Agency</i> * OJ 2004 L 349/1 amd by Reg. 863/2007 (OJ 2007 L 199/30): <i>Border guard teams</i> amd by Reg. 1168/2011 (OJ 2011 L 304/1)</p>	<b>Frontex</b>
	<p><b>Regulation 1931/2006</b> <i>Local border traffic within enlarged EU at external borders of EU</i> * OJ 2006 L 405/1 amd by Reg. 1342/2011 (OJ 2011 L 347/41)</p>	<b>Local Border traffic</b>
	<i>CJEU judgments</i>	
	<p>☞ CJEU C-254/11 <i>Shomodi</i></p> <p>See further: § 2.3</p>	<p>21 Mar. 2013 Art. 2(a) + 3(3)</p>
	<p><b>Regulation 265/2010</b> <i>On movement of persons with a long-stay Visa</i> * OJ 2010 L 85/1</p>	<b>Long Stay Visa Code</b>
<b>New</b>	<p><b>Regulation 656/2014</b> <i>Establishing rules for the surveillance of the external sea borders in the context of operational cooperation coordinated by Frontex</i> * OJ 2014 L 189/93</p>	<b>Maritime Surveillance</b>
	<p><b>Directive 2004/82</b> <i>On the obligation of carriers to communicate passenger data</i> * OJ 2004 L 261/64</p>	<b>Passenger Data</b>
		UK opt in

**Regulation 2252/2004**

**Passports**

*On standards for security features and biometrics in passports and travel documents*

- \* OJ 2004 L 385/1  
amd by Reg. 444/2009 (OJ 2009 L 142/1)

*CJEU judgments*

- ☞ CJEU C-139/13 *Comm. v Belgium* 13 Feb. 2014 Art. 6
- ☞ CJEU C-291/12 *Schwarz* 17 Oct. 2013 Art. 1(2)

*CJEU pending cases*

- ☞ CJEU C-101/13 *U.* pending
  - ☞ CJEU C-446/12 *Willems a.o.* pending Art. 4(3)
- See further: § 2.3

**Recommendation 761/2005**

**Researchers**

*On uniform short-stay visas for researchers from third countries*

- \* OJ 2005 L 289/23

**Regulation 1053/2013**

**Schengen Evaluation**

*Schengen Evaluation*

- \* OJ 2013 L 295/27

**Regulation 1987/2006**

**SIS II**

*Establishing second generation Schengen Information System*

- \* OJ 2006 L 381/4
- \* Replacing:  
Reg. 378/2004 (OJ 2004 L 64)  
Reg. 871/2004 (OJ 2004 L 162/29)  
Reg. 2424/2001 (OJ 2001 L 328/4)  
Reg. 1988/2006 (OJ 2006 L 411/1)
- Ending validity of:  
Dec. 2001/886; 2005/451; 2005/728; 2006/628

**New**

**Decision 565/2014**

**Transit Bulgaria a.o. countries**

*Transit through Bulgaria, Croatia, Cyprus and Romania*

- \* OJ 2014 L 157/23
- \* repealing Dec. 895/2006 and Dec. 582/2008 (OJ 2008 L 161/30)

**Regulation 693/2003**

**Transit Documents**

*Establishing a specific Facilitated Transit Document (FTD) and a Facilitated Rail Transit Document (FRTD)*

- \* OJ 2003 L 99/8

**Regulation 694/2003**

**Transit Documents Format**

*Format for Facilitated Transit Documents (FTD) and Facilitated Rail Transit Documents (FRTD)*

- \* OJ 2003 L 99/15

**Decision 586/2008**

**Transit Switzerland**

*Transit through Switzerland and Liechtenstein*

- \* OJ 2008 L 162/27
- \* amending Dec. 896/2006 (OJ 2006 L 167)

**Decision 1105/2011**

**Travel Documents**

*On the list of travel documents which entitle the holder to cross the external borders*

- \* OJ 2011 L 287/9

**Decision 512/2004**

**VIS**

*Establishing Visa Information System (VIS)*

- \* OJ 2004 L 213/5

**Regulation 767/2008**

**VIS**

*Establishing Visa Information System (VIS) and the exchange of data between MS*

- \* OJ 2008 L 218/60
- \* Third-pillar VIS Decision (OJ 2008 L 218/129)

**Regulation 1077/2011**

**VIS Management Agency**

*Establishing an Agency to manage VIS, SIS & Eurodac*

- \* OJ 2011 L 286/1

**Regulation 810/2009**

**Visa Code**

*Establishing a Community Code on Visas*

- \* OJ 2009 L 243/1
- amd by Reg. 154/2012 (OJ 2012 L 58/3)

*CJEU judgments*

<b>New</b>	☞ CJEU C-575/12 <i>Air Baltic</i>	4 Sep. 2014	Art. 24(1) + 34
	☞ CJEU C-84/12 <i>Koushkaki</i>	19 Dec. 2013	Art. 23(4) + 32(1)
	☞ CJEU C-39/12 <i>Dang</i>	18 June 2012	Art. 21 + 34 - deleted
	☞ CJEU C-83/12 <i>Vo</i>	10 Apr. 2012	Art. 21 + 34

See further: § 2.3

**Regulation 1683/95**

**Visa Format**

*Uniform format for visas*

- \* OJ 1995 L 164/1
- amd by Reg. 334/2002 (OJ 2002 L 53/7)
- amd by Reg. 856/2008 (OJ 2008 L 235/1)

UK opt in

**Regulation 539/2001**

**Visa List**

*Listing the third countries whose nationals must be in possession of visas*

- \* OJ 2001 L 81/1
- amd by Reg. 2414/2001 (OJ 2001 L 327/1): *Moving Romania to 'white list'*
- amd by Reg. 453/2003 (OJ 2003 L 69/10): *Moving Ecuador to 'black list'*
- amd by Reg. 851/2005 (OJ 2005 L 141/3): *On reciprocity for visas*
- amd by Reg. 1932/2006 (OJ 2006 L 405/23)
- amd by Reg. 1244/2009 (OJ 2009 L 336/1): *Lifting visa req. for some Western Balkan countries*
- amd by Reg. 1091/2010 (OJ 2010 L 329/1): *Lifting visa req. for Albania and Bosnia*
- amd by Reg. 1211/2010 (OJ 2010 L 339/6): *Lifting visa req. for Taiwan*
- amd by Reg. 1289/2013 (OJ 2013 L 347/74)
- amd by Reg. 259/2014 (OJ 2014 L 105/9): *lifting visa req. for Moldova*
- New** amd by Reg. 509/2014 (OJ 2014 L 149/67): *Lifting visa req. for Pacific nations*

**Regulation 333/2002**

**Visa Stickers**

*Uniform format for forms for affixing the visa*

- \* OJ 2002 L 53/4

UK opt in

**ECHR**

**Anti-torture**

*European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms and its Protocols*

Art. 3 Prohibition of Torture, Degrading Treatment

- \* ETS 005 (4-11-50) impl. date 1950

*ECtHR Judgments*

☞ ECtHR Ap.no. 53608/11 <i>B.M. v GR</i>	19 Dec. 2013	Art. 3 + 13
☞ ECtHR Ap.no. 55352/12 <i>Aden Ahmed v MAL</i>	23 July 2013	Art. 3 + 5
☞ ECtHR Ap.no. 11463/09 <i>Samaras v GR</i>	28 Feb. 2012	Art. 3
☞ ECtHR Ap.no. 27765/09 <i>Hirsi v IT</i>	21 Feb. 2012	Art. 3 + 13

See further: § 2.3

2.2 Borders and Visas: Proposed Measures

**Regulation amending Regulation 562/2006**

**Borders Code II**

*On the temporary reintroduction of border control at internal borders in exceptional circumstances*

- \* COM (2013) 96, 27 Feb. 2013
- \* under discussion in Council

**Regulation**

**EES**

*Establishing an Entry/Exit System (EES) to register entry and exit data of third country nationals crossing the external borders*

- \* COM (2013) 95, 27 Feb. 2013
- \* under discussion in Council

<b>New</b>	<b>Regulation</b> <i>Establishing Touring Visa</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* Com (2014) 163</li> <li>* under discussion in Council April 2014 amending: Reg. 562/2006 Borders Code Reg. 767/2008 VIS</li> </ul>	<b>Touring Visa</b>
	<b>Regulation amending Regulation 562/2006</b> <i>Establishing a Registered Traveller Programme (RTP)</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* COM (2013) 97, 27 Feb. 2013</li> <li>* under discussion in Council</li> </ul>	<b>Travellers</b>
<b>New</b>	<b>Regulation</b> <i>Recast of the Visa Code</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* Com (2014) 164</li> <li>* under discussion in Council April 2014</li> </ul>	<b>Visa Code II</b>
	<b>Regulation</b> <i>Codifying Regulations establishing EU visa list</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* COM (2008) 761, 28 Nov. 2008</li> <li>* replacing Reg. 539/2001 discussion terminated in Council working group</li> </ul>	<b>Visa List II</b>

## 2.3 Borders and Visas: Jurisprudence

### 2.3.1 CJEU Judgments on Borders and Visas

- ☞ CJEU C-278/12 (PPU) *Adil* [19 July 2012]
  - \* interpr. of Reg. 562/2006 **Borders Code** [Art. 20 + 21]
  - \* *The Schengen Borders Code must be interpreted as not precluding national legislation, such as that at issue in the main proceedings, which enables officials responsible for border surveillance and the monitoring of foreign nationals to carry out checks, in a geographic area 20 kilometres from the land border between a MS and the State parties to the CISA, with a view to establishing whether the persons stopped satisfy the requirements for lawful residence applicable in the MS concerned, when those checks are based on general information and experience regarding the illegal residence of persons at the places where the checks are to be made, when they may also be carried out to a limited extent in order to obtain such general information and experience-based data in that regard, and when the carrying out of those checks is subject to certain limitations concerning, inter alia, their intensity and frequency.*
- New** ☞ CJEU C-575/12 *Air Baltic* [4 Sep. 2014]
  - \* interpr. of Reg. 562/2006 **Borders Code** [Art. 5]
  - \* *The Borders Code precludes national legislation, which makes the entry of TCNs to the territory of the MS concerned subject to the condition that, at the border check, the valid visa presented must necessarily be affixed to a valid travel document.*
- New** ☞ CJEU C-575/12 *Air Baltic* [4 Sep. 2014]
  - \* interpr. of Reg. 810/2009 **Visa Code** [Art. 24(1) + 34]
  - \* *The cancellation of a travel document by an authority of a third country does not mean that the uniform visa affixed to that document is automatically invalidated.*
- ☞ CJEU C-606/10 *ANAFE* [14 June 2012]
  - \* interpr. of Reg. 562/2006 **Borders Code** [Art. 13 + 5(4)(a)]
  - \* annulment of national legislation on visa
  - \* *Article 5(4)(a) must be interpreted as meaning that a MS which issues to a TCN a re-entry visa within the meaning of that provision cannot limit entry into the Schengen area solely to points of entry to its national territory.*  
*The principles of legal certainty and protection of legitimate expectations did not require the provision of transitional measures for the benefit of TCNs who had left the territory of a MS when they were holders of temporary residence permits issued pending examination of a first application*



*for a residence permit or an application for asylum and wanted to return to that territory (after the entry into force of this Regulation)*

- ☞ CJEU C-241/05 **Bot** [4 Oct. 2006]
- \* interpr. of **Schengen Agreement** [Art. 20(1)]
- \* on the conditions of movement of third-country nationals not subject to a visa requirement; on the meaning of ‘first entry’ and successive stays
- \* *This provision allows TCNs not subject to a visa requirement to stay in the Schengen Area for a maximum period of three months during successive periods of six months, provided that each of those periods commences with a ‘first entry’.*
- ☞ CJEU C-139/13 **Comm. v Belgium** [13 Feb. 2014]
- \* violation of Reg. 2252/2004 **Passports** [Art. 6]
- \* *Failure to implement biometric passports containing digital fingerprints within the prescribed periods.*
- ☞ CJEU C-257/01 **Comm. v Council** [18 Jan. 2005]
- \* challenge to Regs. 789/2001 and 790/2001
- \* upholding validity of Regs.
- ☞ CJEU C-39/12 **Dang** [18 June 2012] (deleted)
- \* interpr. of Reg. 810/2009 **Visa Code** [Art. 21 + 34 - deleted]
- \* *Whether penalties can be applied in the case of foreign nationals in possession of a visa which was obtained by deception from a competent authority of another Member State but has not yet been annulled pursuant to the regulation.*
- ☞ CJEU C-355/10 **EP v Council** [5 Sep. 2012]
- \* violation of Reg. 562/2006 **Borders Code**
- \* annulment of measure supplementing Borders Code
- \* *The CJEU decided to annul Council Decision 2010/252 of 26 April 2010 supplementing the Borders Code as regards the surveillance of the sea external borders in the context of operational cooperation coordinated by the European Agency for the Management of Operational Cooperation at the External Borders of the Member States of the European Union. According to the Court, this decision contains essential elements of the surveillance of the sea external borders of the Member States which go beyond the scope of the additional measures within the meaning of Art. 12(5) of the Borders Code. As only the European Union legislature was entitled to adopt such a decision, this could not have been decided by comitology. Furthermore the Court ruled that the effects of decision 2010/252 maintain until the entry into force of new rules within a reasonable time.*
- ☞ CJEU C-261/08 & C-348/08 **Garcia & Cabrera** [22 Oct. 2009]
- \* interpr. of Reg. 562/2006 **Borders Code** [Art. 5, 11 + 13]
- \* Member States are not obliged to expel a third-country national who is unlawfully present on the territory of a Member State because the conditions of duration of stay are not or no longer fulfilled
- \* *Where a TCN is unlawfully present on the territory of a MS because he or she does not fulfil, or no longer fulfils, the conditions of duration of stay applicable there, that MS is not obliged to adopt a decision to expel that person.*
- ☞ CJEU C-430/10 **Gaydarov** [17 Nov. 2011]
- \* interpr. of Reg. 562/2006 **Borders Code**
- \* *Reg. does not preclude national legislation that permits the restriction of the right of a national of a MS to travel to another MS in particular on the ground that he has been convicted of a criminal offence of narcotic drug trafficking in another State, provided that (i) the personal conduct of that national constitutes a genuine, present and sufficiently serious threat affecting one of the fundamental interests of society, (ii) the restrictive measure envisaged is appropriate to ensure the achievement of the objective it pursues and does not go beyond what is necessary to attain it and (iii) that measure is subject to effective judicial review permitting a determination of its legality as regards matters of fact and law in the light of the requirements of European Union law.*
- ☞ CJEU C-88/12 **Jaoo** [14 Sep. 2012] (deleted)
- \* interpr. of Reg. 562/2006 **Borders Code** [Art. 20 + 21 - deleted]
- \* *On statutory provision authorising, in the context of countering illegal residence after borders have been crossed, police checks in the area between the land border of the Netherlands with Belgium or*

*Germany and a line situated within 20 kilometres of that border*

- ☞ CJEU C-84/12 **Koushkaki** [19 Dec. 2013]
- \* interpr. of Reg. 810/2009 **Visa Code** [Art. 23(4) + 32(1)]
- \* *Art. 23(4), 32(1) and 35(6) must be interpreted as meaning that the competent authorities of a MS cannot refuse a visa to an applicant unless one of the grounds for refusal of a visa listed in those provisions can be applied to that applicant. In the examinations of those conditions and the relevant facts, authorities have a wide discretion. The obligation to issue a uniform visa is subject to the condition that there is no reasonable doubt that the applicant intends to leave the territory of the Member States before the expiry of the visa applied for.*
  
- ☞ CJEU C-139/08 **Kjiku** [2 Apr. 2009]
- \* interpr. of Dec. 896/2006 **Transit Switzerland** [Art. 1 + 2]
- \* on transit visa legislation for third-country nationals subject to a visa requirement
- \* *Residence permits issued by the Swiss Confederation or the Principality of Liechtenstein to TCNs subject to a visa requirement, are considered to be equivalent to a transit visa only.*
  
- ☞ CJEU C-188/10 & C-189/10 **Melki & Abdeli** [22 June 2010]
- \* interpr. of Reg. 562/2006 **Borders Code** [Art. 20 + 21]
- \* consistency of national law and European Union law, abolition of border control and the area of 20 kilometres from the land border
- \* *The French 'stop and search' law, which allowed for controls behind the internal border, is in violation of article 20 and 21 of the Borders code, due to the lack of requirement of "behaviour and of specific circumstances giving rise to a risk of breach of public order". According to the Court, controls may not have an effect equivalent to border checks.*
  
- ☞ CJEU C-291/12 **Schwarz** [17 Oct. 2013]
- \* interpr. of Reg. 2252/2004 **Passports** [Art. 1(2)]
- \* *Although the taking and storing of fingerprints in passports constitutes an infringement of the rights to respect for private life and the protection of personal data, such measures are nonetheless justified for the purpose of preventing any fraudulent use of passports.*
  
- ☞ CJEU C-254/11 **Shomodi** [21 Mar. 2013]
- \* interpr. of Reg. 1931/2006 **Local Border traffic** [Art. 2(a) + 3(3)]
- \* *The holder of a local border traffic permit must be able to move freely within the border area for a period of three months if his stay is uninterrupted and to have a new right to a three-month stay each time that his stay is interrupted. There is such an interruption of stay upon the crossing of the border irrespective of the frequency of such crossings, even if they occur several times daily.*
  
- ☞ CJEU C-77/05 & C-137/05 **UK v Council** [18 Dec. 2007]
- \* validity of Border Agency Regulation and Passport Regulation
- \* judgment against UK
  
- ☞ CJEU C-482/08 **UK v Council** [26 Oct. 2010]
- \* annulment of decision on police access to VIS, due to UK non-participation
- \* judgment against UK
  
- ☞ CJEU C-83/12 **Vo** [10 Apr. 2012]
- \* interpr. of Reg. 810/2009 **Visa Code** [Art. 21 + 34]
- \* *First substantive decision on Visa Code. The Court rules that the Visa Code does not preclude that national legislation of one MS penalises migration-related identity fraud with genuine visa issued by another MS.*
  
- ☞ CJEU C-23/12 **Zakaria** [17 Jan. 2013]
- \* interpr. of Reg. 562/2006 **Borders Code** [Art. 13(3)]
- \* *MSs are obliged to establish a means of obtaining redress only against decisions to refuse entry.*

### 2.3.2 CJEU pending cases on Borders and Visas

- ☞ CJEU C-101/13 **U.**
- \* interpr. of Reg. 2252/2004 **Passports**
- \* **AG: 30 Apr. 2014**
- \* ref. from 'Verwaltungsgerichtshof Baden-Württemberg' (Germany)

- \* *About the recording and spelling of names, surnames and family names in passports.*
- ☞ CJEU C-446/12 *Willems a.o.*
- \* interpr. of Reg. 2252/2004 **Passports** [Art. 4(3)]
- \* ref. from 'Raad van State' (Netherlands)
- \* *Reference for a preliminary ruling about the question whether a person has a right to be issued with a passport without having his or her fingerprints stored.*

### 2.3.3 ECtHR Judgments on Borders and Visas

- ☞ ECtHR Ap.no. 55352/12 *Aden Ahmed v MAL* [23 July 2013]
- \* violation of **ECHR** [Art. 3 + 5]
- \* *The case concerns a migrant who had entered Malta in an irregular manner by boat. The ECtHR found a violation of art. 5(1), mainly due to the failure of the Maltese authorities to pursue deportation or to do so with due diligence, and of art. 5(4) due to absence of an effective and speedy domestic remedy to challenge the lawfulness of their detention. Also, the ECtHR requested the Maltese authorities (Art. 46) to establish a mechanism allowing a determination of the lawfulness of immigration detention within a reasonable time-limit. In this case the Court for the first time found Malta in violation of art. 3 because of the immigration detention conditions. Those conditions in which the applicant had been living for 14½ months were, taken as a whole, amounted to degrading treatment.*
- ☞ ECtHR Ap.no. 53608/11 *B.M. v GR* [19 Dec. 2013]
- \* violation of **ECHR** [Art. 3 + 13]
- \* *The applicant was an Iranian journalist who alleged to have been arrested and tortured due to his involvement in protests against the government. After his arrival in Greece a decision had been taken to return him to Turkey, and he had been held in custody in a police station and in various detention centres. His application for asylum was first not registered by the Greek authorities, and later they dismissed the application. The application mainly concerned the conditions of detention, in particular overcrowding, unhygienic conditions, lack of external contact, and lack of access to telephone, translators and any kind of information. Referring to its previous case law, the ECtHR held these conditions to be in violation of Art. 3. As there had been no effective domestic remedy against that situation, Art. 13 in combination with art. 3 had also been violated.*
- ☞ ECtHR Ap.no. 27765/09 *Hirsi v IT* [21 Feb. 2012]
- \* violation of **ECHR** [Art. 3 + 13]
- \* *The Court concluded that the decision of the Italian authorities to send TCNs - who were intercepted outside the territorial waters of Italy - back to Libya, had exposed them to the risk of ill-treatment there, as well as to the risk of ill-treatment if they were sent back to their countries of origin (Somalia and Eritrea). For the first time the Court applied Article 4 of Protocol no. 4 (prohibition of collective expulsion) in the circumstance of aliens who were not physically present on the territory of the State, but in the high seas. Italy was also held responsible for exposing the aliens to a treatment in violation with Article 3 ECHR, as it transferred them to Libya 'in full knowledge of the facts' and circumstances in Libya. The Court also concluded that they had had no effective remedy in Italy against the alleged violations (Art. 13).*
- ☞ ECtHR Ap.no. 11463/09 *Samaras v GR* [28 Feb. 2012]
- \* violation of **ECHR** [Art. 3]
- \* *The conditions of detention of the applicants – one Somali and twelve Greek nationals – at Ioannina prison were held to constitute degrading treatment in violation of ECHR art. 3.*

### 2.3.4 National Judgments on Borders and Visas

- ☞ **Germany**: BVerwG 1 C 1.10 [11 Jan. 2011]
- \* interpretation of **Reg. 810/2009 on Visa Code**
- interpretation of **ECHR** Art. 8
- \* appeal from Berlin-Brandenburg Higher Administrative Court, 18 Dec. 2009

- \* <http://cmr.jur.ru.nl/nemis/Germany/BVerwG1C110.pdf>
- \* *A Moroccan national seeks a Schengen visa to visit her two minor children living with her father in Germany. The visa is denied, primarily based on the assumption that there is no specific credible prospect of return. Although the court states that the child's personal contact and continuity of emotional bonds with both parents serve as a general rule toward developing the child's personality, the court does not find the denial of the visa disproportionate because the maintenance of family ties can be realised through other means and visits outside Germany.*

### 3 Irregular Migration

#### 3.1 Irregular Migration: Adopted Measures

<b>Directive 2001/51</b>	<b>Carrier sanctions</b>	
<i>Obligation of carriers to return TCNs when entry is refused</i>		
* OJ 2001 L 187/45	impl. date 11 Feb. 2003	UK opt in
<b>Decision 267/2005</b>	<b>Early Warning System</b>	
<i>Establishing a secure web-based Information and Coordination Network for MS' Migration Management Services</i>		
* OJ 2005 L 83/48		UK opt in
<b>Directive 2009/52</b>	<b>Employers Sanctions</b>	
<i>Minimum standards on sanctions and measures against employers of illegally staying TCNs</i>		
* OJ 2009 L 168/24	impl. date 20 July 2011	
<b>Directive 2003/110</b>	<b>Expulsion by Air</b>	
<i>Assistance with transit for expulsion by air</i>		
* OJ 2003 L 321/26		
<b>Decision 191/2004</b>	<b>Expulsion Costs</b>	
<i>On the compensation of the financial imbalances resulting from the mutual recognition of decisions on the expulsion of TCNs</i>		
* OJ 2004 L 60/55		UK opt in
<b>Directive 2001/40</b>	<b>Expulsion Decisions</b>	
<i>Mutual recognition of expulsion decisions of TCNs</i>		
* OJ 2001 L 149/34	impl. date 2 Oct. 2002	UK opt in
<b>Decision 573/2004</b>	<b>Expulsion Joint Flights</b>	
<i>On the organisation of joint flights for removals from the territory of two or more MSs, of TCNs</i>		
* OJ 2004 L 261/28		UK opt in
<b>Conclusion</b>	<b>Expulsion via Land</b>	
<i>Transit via land for expulsion</i>		
* adopted 22 Dec. 2003 by Council		UK opt in
<b>Directive &amp; Framework Decision 2002/90</b>	<b>Illegal Entry</b>	
<i>Facilitation of unauthorised entry, transit and residence</i>		
* OJ 2002 L 328		UK opt in
<b>Regulation 377/2004</b>	<b>Immigration Liaison Officers</b>	
<i>On the creation of an immigration liaison officers network</i>		
* OJ 2004 L 64/1		UK opt in
<b>Regulation amending Regulation 493/2011</b>	<b>Liaison Officers</b>	
<i>On the creation of an immigration liaison officers network</i>		
* OJ 2011 L 141/13 (Mar. 2011)		UK opt in
applies from 16 June 2011		
<b>Directive 2008/115</b>	<b>Return Directive</b>	
<i>On common standards and procedures in MSs for returning illegally staying TCNs</i>		

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* OJ 2008 L 348/98</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>impl. date 24 Dec. 2010</li> </ul>
<p style="color: blue; margin: 0;"><i>CJEU judgments</i></p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>New</b> ☞ CJEU C-473/13 &amp; C-514/13 <i>Bero &amp; Bouzalmate</i></li> <li><b>New</b> ☞ CJEU C-474/13 <i>Pham</i></li> <li><b>New</b> ☞ CJEU C-189/13 <i>Da Silva</i></li> <li><b>New</b> ☞ CJEU C-146/14 (PPU) <i>Mahdi</i></li> <li>☞ CJEU C-297/12 <i>Filev &amp; Osmani</i></li> <li>☞ CJEU C-383/13 (PPU) <i>G and R</i></li> <li>☞ CJEU C-534/11 <i>Arslan</i></li> <li>☞ CJEU C-522/11 <i>Mbaye</i></li> <li>☞ CJEU C-51/12 <i>Zhu</i></li> <li>☞ CJEU C-430/11 <i>Sagor</i></li> <li>☞ CJEU C-73/12 <i>Ettaghi</i></li> <li>☞ CJEU C-329/11 <i>Achughbabian</i></li> <li>☞ CJEU C-61/11 (PPU) <i>El Dridi</i></li> <li>☞ CJEU C-357/09 (PPU) <i>Kadzoev</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>17 July 2014 Art. 16(1)</li> <li>17 July 2014 Art. 16(1)</li> <li>3 July 2014 inadmissible</li> <li>5 June 2014 Art. 15</li> <li>19 Sep. 2013 Art. 2(2)(b) + 11</li> <li>10 Sep. 2013 Art. 15(2) + 6</li> <li>30 May 2013 Art. 2(1)</li> <li>21 Mar. 2013 Art. 2(2)(b) + 7(4)</li> <li>16 Feb. 2013 Art. 2-8, 15 + 16 - deleted</li> <li>6 Dec. 2012 Art. 2, 15 + 16</li> <li>4 July 2012 Art. 2-8, 15 + 16 - deleted</li> <li>6 Dec. 2011</li> <li>28 Apr. 2011 Art. 15 + 16</li> <li>30 Nov. 2009 Art. 15(4), (5) + (6)</li> </ul>
<p style="color: blue; margin: 0;"><i>CJEU pending cases</i></p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>☞ CJEU C-166/13 <i>Mukarubega</i></li> <li>☞ CJEU C-249/13 <i>Boudjlida</i></li> <li><b>New</b> ☞ CJEU C-290/14 <i>Celaj</i></li> <li>☞ CJEU C-38/14 <i>Zaizoune</i></li> <li>☞ CJEU C-554/13 <i>Zh. &amp; O.</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>pending Art. 3 + 7</li> <li>pending</li> <li>pending</li> <li>pending Art. 4(2) + 6(1)</li> <li>pending Art. 7(4)</li> </ul>
<p style="color: blue; margin: 0;"><i>National Judgments</i></p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>☞ Ger: BVerwG 1 C 19.11</li> <li>See further: § 3.3</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>10 July 2012</li> </ul>
<p><b>Decision 575/2007</b></p> <p><i>Establishing the European Return Fund as part of the General Programme Solidarity and Management of Migration Flows</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* OJ 2007 L 144</li> </ul>	<p><b>Return Programme</b></p> <p style="text-align: right;">UK opt in</p>
<p><b>Directive 2011/36</b></p> <p><i>On preventing and combating trafficking in human beings and protecting its victims</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* OJ 2011 L 101/1 (Mar. 2011)</li> <li>* Replacing Framework Decision 2002/629 (OJ 2002 L 203/1)</li> </ul>	<p><b>Trafficking Persons</b></p> <p style="text-align: right;">UK opt in</p>
<p><b>Directive 2004/81</b></p> <p><i>Residence permits for TCNs who are victims of trafficking</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* OJ 2004 L 261/19</li> </ul>	<p><b>Trafficking Victims</b></p>
<p style="color: blue; margin: 0;"><i>CJEU judgments</i></p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>☞ CJEU C-266/08 <i>Comm. v Spain</i></li> <li>See further: § 3.3</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>14 May 2009</li> </ul>
<p><b>ECHR Detention - Collective Expulsion</b></p>	
<p><i>European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms and its Protocols</i></p>	
<p>Art. 5 Detention</p>	
<p>Prot. 4 Art. 4 Collective Expulsion</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* ETS 005 (4-11-50)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>impl. date 1950</li> </ul>
<p style="color: blue; margin: 0;"><i>ECtHR Judgments</i></p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>☞ ECtHR Ap.no. 55352/12 <i>Aden Ahmed v MAL</i></li> <li>☞ ECtHR Ap.no. 53709/11 <i>A.F. v GR</i></li> <li>☞ ECtHR Ap.no. 13058/11 <i>Abdelhakim v HU</i></li> <li>☞ ECtHR Ap.no. 13457/11 <i>Ali Said v HU</i></li> <li>☞ ECtHR Ap.no. 50520/09 <i>Ahmade v GR</i></li> <li>☞ ECtHR Ap.no. 14902/10 <i>Mahmundi v GR</i></li> <li>☞ ECtHR Ap.no. 27765/09 <i>Hirsi v IT</i></li> <li>☞ ECtHR Ap.no. 10816/10 <i>Lokpo &amp; Touré v HU</i></li> <li>See further: § 3.3</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>23 July 2013 Art. 3 + 5</li> <li>13 June 2013 Art. 5</li> <li>23 Oct. 2012 Art. 5</li> <li>23 Oct. 2012 Art. 5</li> <li>25 Sep. 2012 Art. 5</li> <li>31 July 2012 Art. 5</li> <li>21 Feb. 2012 Prot. 4 Art. 4</li> <li>20 Sep. 2011 Art. 5</li> </ul>

3.2 Irregular Migration: Proposed Measures

- \* nothing to report

3.3 Irregular Migration: Jurisprudence

3.3.1 CJEU Judgments on Irregular Migration

- ☞ CJEU C-329/11 *Achughbabian* [6 Dec. 2011]
  - \* interpr. of Dir. 2008/115 **Return Directive**
  - \* *The directive precludes national legislation permitting the imprisonment of an illegally staying third-country national who has not (yet) been subject to the coercive measures provided for in the directive and has not, if detained with a view to be returned, reached the expiry of the maximum duration of that detention. The directive does not preclude penal sanctions being imposed after full application of the return procedure established by that directive.*
- ☞ CJEU C-534/11 *Arslan* [30 May 2013]
  - \* interpr. of Dir. 2008/115 **Return Directive** [Art. 2(1)]
  - \* *The Return Dir. does not apply during the period from the making of the (asylum) application to the adoption of the decision at first instance on that application or, as the case may be, until the outcome of any action brought against that decision is known.*
- New** ☞ CJEU C-473/13 & C-514/13 *Bero & Bouzalmate* [17 July 2014]
  - \* interpr. of Dir. 2008/115 **Return Directive** [Art. 16(1)]
  - \* *As a rule, a MS is required to detain illegally staying TCNs for the purpose of removal in a specialised detention facility of that State even if the MS has a federal structure and the federated state competent to decide upon and carry out such detention under national law does not have such a detention facility.*
- ☞ CJEU C-266/08 *Comm. v Spain* [14 May 2009]
  - \* non-transp. of Dir. 2004/81 **Trafficking Victims**
  - \* *On the status of victims of trafficking and smuggling*
- New** ☞ CJEU C-189/13 *Da Silva* [3 July 2014] (inadmissible)
  - \* interpr. of Dir. 2008/115 **Return Directive** [inadmissible]
  - \* *On the permissibility of national legislation imposing a custodial sentence for the offence of illegal entry prior to the institution of deportation proceedings.*
- ☞ CJEU C-61/11 (PPU) *El Dridi* [28 Apr. 2011]
  - \* interpr. of Dir. 2008/115 **Return Directive** [Art. 15 + 16]
  - \* *The Return Directive precludes that a Member State has legislation which provides for a sentence of imprisonment to be imposed on an illegally staying TCN on the sole ground that he remains, without valid grounds, on the territory of that State, contrary to an order to leave that territory within a given period.*
- ☞ CJEU C-73/12 *Ettaghi* [4 July 2012] (deleted)
  - \* interpr. of Dir. 2008/115 **Return Directive** [Art. 2-8, 15 + 16 - deleted]
- ☞ CJEU C-297/12 *Filev & Osmani* [19 Sep. 2013]
  - \* interpr. of Dir. 2008/115 **Return Directive** [Art. 2(2)(b) + 11]
  - \* *Directive must be interpreted as precluding a MS from providing that an expulsion or removal order which predates by five years or more the period between the date on which that directive should have been implemented and the date on which it was implemented, may subsequently be used as a basis for criminal proceedings, where that order was based on a criminal law sanction (within the meaning of Article 2(2)(b)) and where that MS exercised the discretion provided for under that provision.*
- ☞ CJEU C-383/13 (PPU) *G and R* [10 Sep. 2013]
  - \* interpr. of Dir. 2008/115 **Return Directive** [Art. 15(2) + 6]
  - \* *If the extension of a detention measure has been decided in an administrative procedure in breach of the right to be heard, the national court responsible for assessing the lawfulness of that extension decision may order the lifting of the detention measure only if it considers, in the light of all of the factual and legal circumstances of each case, that the infringement at issue actually deprived the*

*party relying thereon of the possibility of arguing his defence better, to the extent that the outcome of that administrative procedure could have been different.*

- ☞ CJEU C-357/09 (PPU) **Kadzoev** [30 Nov. 2009]
- \* interpr. of Dir. 2008/115 **Return Directive** [Art. 15(4), (5) + (6)]
- \* *The maximum duration of detention must include a period of detention completed in connection with a removal procedure commenced before the rules in the directive become applicable. Only a real prospect that removal can be carried out successfully, having regard to the periods laid down in Article 15(5) and (6), corresponds to a reasonable prospect of removal, and that that reasonable prospect does not exist where it appears unlikely that the person concerned will be admitted to a third country, having regard to those periods.*

**New**

- ☞ CJEU C-146/14 (PPU) **Mahdi** [5 June 2014]
- \* interpr. of Dir. 2008/115 **Return Directive** [Art. 15]
- \* *Any decision adopted by a competent authority, on expiry of the maximum period allowed for the initial detention of a TCN, on the further course to take concerning the detention must be in the form of a written measure that includes the reasons in fact and in law for that decision. The Dir. precludes that an initial six-month period of detention may be extended solely because the third-country national concerned has no identity documents.*

- ☞ CJEU C-522/11 **Mbaye** [21 Mar. 2013]
- \* interpr. of Dir. 2008/115 **Return Directive** [Art. 2(2)(b) + 7(4)]
- \* *The directive does not preclude that a fine because of illegal stay of a TCN in a MS is replaced by expulsion if there is a risk of absconding.*

**New**

- ☞ CJEU C-474/13 **Pham** [17 July 2014]
- \* interpr. of Dir. 2008/115 **Return Directive** [Art. 16(1)]
- \* *The Dir. does not permit a MS to detain a TCN for the purpose of removal in prison accommodation together with ordinary prisoners even if the TCN consents thereto.*

- ☞ CJEU C-430/11 **Sagor** [6 Dec. 2012]
- \* interpr. of Dir. 2008/115 **Return Directive** [Art. 2, 15 + 16]
- \* *An illegal stay by a TCN in a MS:*
  - (1) *can be penalised by means of a fine, which may be replaced by an expulsion order;*
  - (2) *can not be penalised by means of a home detention order unless that order is terminated as soon as the physical transportation of the TCN out of that MS is possible.*

- ☞ CJEU C-51/12 **Zhu** [16 Feb. 2013] (deleted)
- \* interpr. of Dir. 2008/115 **Return Directive** [Art. 2-8, 15 + 16 - deleted]
- \* *Whether it is possible to substitute for the fine (for entering national territory illegally or staying there illegally) an order for immediate expulsion for a period of at least five years or a measure restricting freedom ('permanenza domiciliare').*

### 3.3.2 CJEU pending cases on Irregular Migration

- ☞ CJEU C-249/13 **Boudjlida**
- \* interpr. of Dir. 2008/115 **Return Directive**
- \* **AG: 25 Aug. 2014**
- \* ref. from 'Tribunal administratif de Pau' (France)
- \* *On the extent of the rights of the defence and the right to be heard.*

**New**

- ☞ CJEU C-290/14 **Celaj**
- \* interpr. of Dir. 2008/115 **Return Directive**
- \* *Does the Dir. precludes a MS's legislation which provides for the imposition of a sentence of imprisonment of up to four years on an illegally staying TCN who, having been returned to his country of origin neither as a criminal law sanction nor as a consequence of a criminal law sanction, has re-entered the territory of the State in breach of a lawful re-entry ban but has not been the subject of the coercive measures provided for by Art. 8 with a view to his swift and effective removal?*

- ☞ CJEU C-166/13 **Mukarubega**
- \* interpr. of Dir. 2008/115 **Return Directive** [Art. 3 + 7]
- \* **AG: 25 Aug. 2014**

- \* ref. from 'Tribunal Administratif de Melun' (France)
- \* *On the right to be heard before the return decision is taken.*
- ☞ CJEU C-38/14 [Zaizoune](#)
- \* interpr. of Dir. 2008/115 **Return Directive** [Art. 4(2) + 6(1)]
- \* ref. from 'Tribunal Superior de Justicia del Pais Vasco' (Spain)
- \* *On financial penalty for illegal stay*
- ☞ CJEU C-554/13 [Zh. & O.](#)
- \* interpr. of Dir. 2008/115 **Return Directive** [Art. 7(4)]
- \* ref. from 'Raad van State' (Netherlands)
- \* *The Dutch request for a preliminary ruling on the meaning of the concept of “risk to public policy”.*

### 3.3.3 ECtHR Judgments on Irregular Migration

- ☞ ECtHR Ap.no. 53709/11 [A.F. v GR](#) [13 June 2013]
- \* violation of **ECHR** [Art. 5]
- \* *An Iranian entering Greece from Turkey had initially not been registered as an asylum seeker by the Greek authorities, which ordered his return to Turkey. However, the Turkish authorities refused to readmit him into Turkey, and he was then detained by the Greek police. Against the background of reports from Greek and international organisations, having visited the relevant police detention facilities either during the applicant's detention or shortly after his release – including the European Committee for the Prevention of Torture, the UN Special Rapporteur on Torture, the German NGO ProAsyl and the Greek National Human Rights Commission – the ECtHR found a violation of art. 3 due to the serious lack of space available to the applicant, also taking the duration of his detention into account. It was thus unnecessary for the Court to examine the applicant's other allegations concerning the detention conditions (art 5 ECHR) which the Government disputed. Yet, the Court noted that the Government's statements in this regard were not in accordance with the findings of the abovementioned organisations.*
- ☞ ECtHR Ap.no. 13058/11 [Abdelhakim v HU](#) [23 Oct. 2012]
- \* violation of **ECHR** [Art. 5]
- \* *This case concerns unlawful detention, without effective judicial review, of an asylum seeker during the examination of his asylum application. The applicant was a Palestinian who had been stopped at the Hungarian border control for using a forged passport.*
- ☞ ECtHR Ap.no. 50520/09 [Ahmade v GR](#) [25 Sep. 2012]
- \* violation of **ECHR** [Art. 5]
- \* *The conditions of detention of the applicant Afghan asylum seeker in two police stations in Athens were found to constitute degrading treatment in breach of ECHR art. 3. Since Greek law did not allow the courts to examine the conditions of detention in centres for irregular immigrants, the applicant did not have an effective remedy in that regard, in violation of ECHR art. 13 taken together with art. 3. The Court found an additional violation of ECHR art. 13 taken together with art. 3, resulting from the structural deficiencies of the Greek asylum system, as evidenced by the period during which the applicant had been awaiting the outcome of his appeal against the refusal of asylum, and the risk that he might be deported before his asylum appeal had been examined. ECHR art. 5 para. 4 was violated due to the lack of judicial competence to review the lawfulness of the deportation constituting the legal basis of detention.*
- ☞ ECtHR Ap.no. 13457/11 [Ali Said v HU](#) [23 Oct. 2012]
- \* violation of **ECHR** [Art. 5]
- \* *This case concerns unlawful detention, without effective judicial review, of an asylum seeker during the examination of his asylum application. The applicants were Iraqi nationals who illegally entered Hungary, applied for asylum and then travelled illegally to the Netherlands from where they were transferred back to Hungary under the Dublin Regulation.*
- ☞ ECtHR Ap.no. 27765/09 [Hirsi v IT](#) [21 Feb. 2012]



- \* violation of **ECHR** [Prot. 4 Art. 4]
- \* *The Court concluded that the decision of the Italian authorities to send TCNs - who were intercepted outside the territorial waters of Italy - back to Libya, had exposed them to the risk of ill-treatment there, as well as to the risk of ill-treatment if they were sent back to their countries of origin (Somalia and Eritrea). They also had been subjected to collective expulsion prohibited by Art. 4 of Protocol No. 4. The Court also concluded that they had had no effective remedy in Italy against the alleged violations.*
- ☞ ECtHR Ap.no. 10816/10 **Lokpo & Touré v HU** [20 Sep. 2011]
- \* violation of **ECHR** [Art. 5]
- \* *The applicants entered Hungary illegally. After their arrest and during subsequent detention they applied for asylum. They were kept however in detention. The Court ruled that Article 5 § 1 (right to liberty and security) was violated, stating that the absence of elaborate reasoning for an applicant's deprivation of liberty renders that measure incompatible with the requirement of lawfulness.*
- ☞ ECtHR Ap.no. 14902/10 **Mahmundi v GR** [31 July 2012]
- \* violation of **ECHR** [Art. 5]
- \* *The conditions of detention of the applicants – Afghan nationals, subsequently seeking asylum in Norway, who had been detained in the Pagani detention centre upon being rescued from a sinking boat by the maritime police – were held to be in violation of ECHR art. 3. In the specific circumstances of this case the treatment during 18 days of detention was considered not only degrading, but also inhuman, mainly due to the fact that the applicants' children had also been detained, some of them separated from their parents. In addition, a female applicant had been in the final stages of pregnancy and had received insufficient medical assistance and no information about the place of her giving birth and what would happen to her and her child. ECHR art. 13, taken together with art. 3, had been violated by the impossibility for the applicants to take any action before the courts to complain of their conditions of detention. ECHR art. 5 para. 4 was violated due to the lack of judicial competence to review the lawfulness of the deportation that constitutes the legal basis for detention.*

#### 3.3.4 National Judgments on Irregular Migration

- ☞ **Germany: BVerwG 1 C 19.11** [10 July 2012]
- \* interpretation of Dir. 2008/115: **Return Directive**
- \* appeal from North Rhine-Westphalia Higher Administrative Court, 5 Sep. 2008
- \* <http://cmr.jur.ru.nl/nemis/Germany/BVerwG1C1911.pdf>
- \* *Foreigners are entitled to have the immigration authority, simultaneously with the issuance of an expulsion, set a time limit for the effects of the expulsion as mentioned in Section 11(1) first and second sentence of the German Residence Act.*

## 4 External Treaties

### 4.1 External Treaties: Association Agreements

#### EC-Turkey Association Agreement

- \* into force 23 Dec. 1963
- National Judgments*
- ☞ NL: Centrale Raad van Beroep, LJN: BR4959      16 Aug. 2011
- See further: § 4.3

#### EC-Turkey Association Agreement Additional Protocol

- \* into force 1 Jan. 1973

#### *CJEU judgments*

- New** ☞ C-138/13 **Dogan (Naime)**      10 July 2014      Art. 41(1)
- ☞ C-221/11 **Demirkan**      24 Sep. 2013      Art. 41(1)
- ☞

C-186/10 <i>Tural Oguz</i>	21 July	2011	Art. 41(1)
☞ C-228/06 <i>Soysal</i>	19 Feb.	2009	Art. 41(1)
☞ C-16/05 <i>Tum &amp; Dari</i>	20 Sep.	2007	Art. 41(1)
☞ C-37/98 <i>Savas</i>	11 May	2000	Art. 41(1)
<i>National Judgments</i>			
☞ NL: Raad van State, 201102803/1/V3	14 Mar.	2012	Art. 41
See further: § 4.3			

**EC-Turkey Association Agreement Decision 1/80**

\* Dec. 1/80 of 19 Sept. 1980 on the Development of the Association

*CJEU judgments*

<b>New</b> ☞ C-91/13 <i>Essent</i>	11 Sep.	2014	Art. 13
☞ C-225/12 <i>Demir</i>	7 Nov.	2013	Art. 13
☞ C-268/11 <i>Gühlbahce</i>	8 Nov.	2012	Art. 6(1) + 10
☞ C-451/11 <i>Dülger</i>	19 July	2012	Art. 7
☞ C-7/10 & C-9/10 <i>Kahveci &amp; Inan</i>	29 Mar.	2012	Art. 7
☞ C-420/08 <i>Erdil</i>	27 Jan.	2012	deleted
☞ C-436/09 <i>Belkiran</i>	13 Jan.	2012	deleted
☞ C-371/08 <i>Ziebell or Örnek</i>	8 Dec.	2011	Art. 14(1)
☞ C-256/11 <i>Dereci et al.</i>	15 Nov.	2011	Art. 13
☞ C-187/10 <i>Unal</i>	29 Sep.	2011	Art. 6(1)
☞ C-484/07 <i>Pehlivan</i>	16 June	2011	Art. 7
☞ C-303/08 <i>Metin Bozkurt</i>	22 Dec.	2010	Art. 7 + 14(1)
☞ C-300/09 & C-301/09 <i>Toprak/Oguz</i>	9 Dec.	2010	Art. 13
☞ C-92/07 <i>Comm. v Netherlands</i>	29 Apr.	2010	Art. 10(1) + 13
☞ C-14/09 <i>Genc</i>	4 Feb.	2010	Art. 6(1)
☞ C-462/08 <i>Bekleyen</i>	21 Jan.	2010	Art. 7(2)
☞ C-242/06 <i>Sahin</i>	17 Sep.	2009	Art. 13
☞ C-337/07 <i>Altun</i>	18 Dec.	2008	Art. 7
☞ C-453/07 <i>Er</i>	25 Sep.	2008	Art. 7
☞ C-294/06 <i>Payir</i>	24 Jan.	2008	Art. 6(1)
☞ C-349/06 <i>Polat</i>	4 Oct.	2007	Art. 7 + 14
☞ C-325/05 <i>Derin</i>	18 July	2007	Art. 6, 7 and 14
☞ C-4/05 <i>Güzeli</i>	26 Oct.	2006	Art. 10(1)
☞ C-502/04 <i>Torun</i>	16 Feb.	2006	Art. 7
☞ C-230/03 <i>Sedef</i>	10 Jan.	2006	Art. 6
☞ C-373/03 <i>Aydinli</i>	7 July	2005	Art. 6 + 7
☞ C-374/03 <i>Gürol</i>	7 July	2005	Art. 9
☞ C-383/03 <i>Dogan (Ergül)</i>	7 July	2005	Art. 6(1) + (2)
☞ C-136/03 <i>Dörr &amp; Unal</i>	2 June	2005	Art. 6(1) + 14(1)
☞ C-467/02 <i>Cetinkaya</i>	11 Nov.	2004	Art. 7 + 14(1)
☞ C-275/02 <i>Ayaz</i>	30 Sep.	2004	Art. 7
☞ C-465/01 <i>Comm. v Austria</i>	16 Sep.	2004	
☞ C-317/01 & C-369/01 <i>Abatay/Sahin</i>	21 Oct.	2003	Art. 13 + 41(1)
☞ C-171/01 <i>Birlikte</i>	8 May	2003	Art. 10(1)
☞ C-188/00 <i>Kurz (Yuze)</i>	19 Nov.	2002	Art. 6(1) + 7
☞ C-89/00 <i>Bicakci</i>	19 Sep.	2000	
☞ C-65/98 <i>Eyüp</i>	22 June	2000	Art. 7
☞ C-329/97 <i>Ergat</i>	16 Mar.	2000	Art. 7
☞ C-340/97 <i>Nazli</i>	10 Feb.	2000	Art. 6(1) + 14(1)
☞ C-1/97 <i>Birden</i>	26 Nov.	1998	Art. 6(1)
☞ C-210/97 <i>Akman</i>	19 Nov.	1998	Art. 7
☞ C-36/96 <i>Günaydin</i>	30 Sep.	1997	Art. 6(1)
☞ C-98/96 <i>Ertanir</i>	30 Sep.	1997	Art. 6(1) + 6(3)
☞ C-285/95 <i>Kol</i>	5 June	1997	Art. 6(1)
☞ C-386/95 <i>Eker</i>	29 May	1997	Art. 6(1)
☞ C-351/95 <i>Kadiman</i>	17 Apr.	1997	Art. 7
☞ C-171/95 <i>Tetik</i>	23 Jan.	1997	Art. 6(1)
☞ C-434/93 <i>Ahmet Bozkurt</i>	6 June	1995	Art. 6(1)

4.1: External Treaties: Association Agreements

☞ C-355/93 <i>Eroglu</i>	5 Oct. 1994	Art. 6(1)
☞ C-237/91 <i>Kus</i>	16 Dec. 1992	Art. 6(1) + 6(3)
☞ C-192/89 <i>Sevince</i>	20 Sep. 1990	Art. 6(1) + 13
☞ C-12/86 <i>Demirel</i>	30 Sep. 1987	Art. 7 + 12
<i>CJEU pending cases</i>		
<b>New</b> ☞ C-176/14 <i>Van Hauthem</i>	pending	Art. 6 + 7
See further: § 4.3		
<b>EC-Turkey Association Agreement Decision 3/80</b>		
* Dec. 3/80 of 19 Sept. 1980 on Social Security		
<i>CJEU judgments</i>		
☞ C-485/07 <i>Akdas</i>	26 May 2011	Art. 6(1)
<i>CJEU pending cases</i>		
☞ C-171/13 <i>Demirci a.o.</i>	pending	Art. 6(1)
See further: § 4.3		

4.2 External Treaties: Readmission

**Hong Kong**

- \* OJ 2004 L 17/23 (into force 1 Mar. 2004) UK opt in

**Macao**

- \* OJ 2004 L 143/97 (into force 1 June 2004) UK opt in

**Sri Lanka**

- \* OJ 2005 L 124/43 (into force 1 May 2005) UK opt in

**Albania**

- \* OJ 2005 L 124 (into force 1 May 2006 (TCN: May 2008)) UK opt in

**Russia**

- \* OJ 2007 L 129 (into force 1 June 2007 (TCN: June 2010)) UK opt in

**Ukraine, Serbia, Montenegro, Bosnia, Macedonia and Moldova**

- \* OJ 2007 L 332 and 334 (into force 1 Jan. 2008 (TCN: Jan. 2010)) UK opt in

**Pakistan**

- \* OJ 2010 L 287/52 (into force 1 Dec. 2010)

**Georgia**

- \* OJ 2011 L 52/47 (into force 1 March 2011)

**New Morocco, Algeria, Turkey and China**

- \* Com (2012) 239 (into force 1 Oct. 2014)

**Cape Verde**

- \* OJ 2013 L 281
- \* concluded Oct. 2013

**Belarus**

- \* negotiation mandate approved by Council, Feb. 2011

**Armenia**

- \* OJ 2013 L 289/13 (into force 1 Jan. 2014)

**Azerbaijan**

- \* COM (2013) 745 (into force 1 Sept. 2014)

4.3 External Treaties: Other

**Norway and Iceland: Dublin Convention**

- \* OJ 1999 L 176/36 (into force 1 March 2001)
- \* Protocol into force 1 May 2006

**Switzerland: Free Movement of Persons**

- \* concl. 28 Feb. 2002 (OJ 2002 L 114) (into force 1 June 2002)

**Switzerland: Implementation of Schengen, Dublin**

- \* OJ 2008 L 83/37 (applied from Dec. 2008)

**China: Approved Destination Status treaty**

- \* OJ 2004 L 83/12 (into force 1 May 2004 )

**Denmark: Dublin II treaty**

- \* OJ 2006 L 66/38 (into force 1 April 2006 )

**Russia: Visa facilitation agreement**

- \* OJ 2007 L 129 (into force 1 June 2007 )

**Ukraine, Serbia, Montenegro, Bosnia, Macedonia, Albania and Moldova: Visa facilitation agreements**

- \* OJ 2007 L 332 and 334 (into force 1 Jan. 2008)

**Georgia: Visa facilitation agreement**

- \* OJ 2010 L 308/1 (into force 1 March 2011)

**Cape Verde: Visa facilitation agreement negotiations**

- \* OJ 2013 L 282/3  
concluded, Oct. 2013

**Mauritius, Antigua/Barbuda, Barbados, Seychelles, St. Kitts and Nevis and Bahamas: Visa abolition treaties agreed**

- \* proposals to sign and conclude treaties, (COM (2009) 48, 49, 50, 52, 53 and 55), 12 Feb. 2009; treaties signed and provisionally into force, May 2009; concluded Nov. 2009

**Brazil: short-stay visa waiver for holders of diplomatic or official passports**

- \* OJ 2011 L 66/1 (into force 24 Feb. 2011)

**Armenia**

- \* OJ 2013 L 289 (into force 1 Jan. 2014)

**Russia, Ukraine, Moldova**

- \* Council mandate to renegotiate visa facilitation treaties, April 2011
- \* proposals to sign and conclude new treaty with Ukraine, July 2012; new treaty with Moldova signed, June 2012  
in force 1 July 2013

**Brazil: short-stay visa waiver for holders of ordinary passports**

- \* OJ 2012 L 255/3 (into force 1 Oct. 2012)

**New****Azerbaijan**

- \* OJ 2013 L 320/7 (into force 1 Sep. 2014)

**Morocco**

- \* proposals to negotiate - approved by council Dec. 2013

## 4.4 External Treaties: Jurisprudence

## 4.4.1 CJEU Judgments on EEC-Turkey Association Agreement

- ☞ C-317/01 & C-369/01 *Abatay/Sahin* [21 Oct. 2003]
- \* interpr. of **Dec. 1/80** [Art. 13 + 41(1)]
- ☞ C-434/93 *Ahmet Bozkurt* [6 June 1995]
- \* interpr. of **Dec. 1/80** [Art. 6(1)]
- ☞ C-485/07 *Akdas* [26 May 2011]
- \* interpr. of **Dec. 3/80** [Art. 6(1)]
- \* *Supplements to social security can not be withdrawn solely on the ground that the beneficiary has moved out of the Member State.*
- ☞ C-210/97 *Akman* [19 Nov. 1998]
- \* interpr. of **Dec. 1/80** [Art. 7]
- ☞ C-337/07 *Altun* [18 Dec. 2008]
- \* interpr. of **Dec. 1/80** [Art. 7]
- ☞ C-275/02 *Ayaz* [30 Sep. 2004]
- \* interpr. of **Dec. 1/80** [Art. 7]

- ☞ C-373/03 *Aydinli* [7 July 2005]
- \* interpr. of **Dec. 1/80** [Art. 6 + 7]
- ☞ C-462/08 *Bekleyen* [21 Jan. 2010]
- \* interpr. of **Dec. 1/80** [Art. 7(2)]
- \* *The child of a Turkish worker has free access to labour and an independent right to stay in Germany, if this child is graduated in Germany and its parents have worked at least three years in Germany.*
- ☞ C-436/09 *Belkiran* [13 Jan. 2012] (deleted)
- \* interpr. of **Dec. 1/80** [deleted]
- \* *Case withdrawn because of judgment C-371/08 (Ziebell). Art. 14(1) of Dec. 1/80 does not have the same scope as art. 28(3)(a) of the Directive on Free Movement.*
- ☞ C-89/00 *Bicakci* [19 Sep. 2000]
- \* interpr. of **Dec. 1/80**
- ☞ C-1/97 *Birden* [26 Nov. 1998]
- \* interpr. of **Dec. 1/80** [Art. 6(1)]
- ☞ C-171/01 *Birlikte* [8 May 2003]
- \* interpr. of **Dec. 1/80** [Art. 10(1)]
- ☞ C-467/02 *Cetinkaya* [11 Nov. 2004]
- \* interpr. of **Dec. 1/80** [Art. 7 + 14(1)]
- ☞ C-465/01 *Comm. v Austria* [16 Sep. 2004]
- \* interpr. of **Dec. 1/80**
- ☞ C-92/07 *Comm. v Netherlands* [29 Apr. 2010]
- \* interpr. of **Dec. 1/80** [Art. 10(1) + 13]
- \* *The obligation to pay charges in order to obtain or extend a residence permit, which are disproportionate compared to charges paid by citizens of the Union is in breach with the standstill clauses of Articles 10(1) and 13 of Decision No 1/80 of the Association.*
- ☞ C-225/12 *Demir* [7 Nov. 2013]
- \* interpr. of **Dec. 1/80** [Art. 13]
- \* Judgment due: 7 Nov. 2013
- \* *Holding a temporary residence permit, which is valid only pending a final decision on the right of residence, does not fall within the meaning of 'legally resident'.*
- ☞ C-12/86 *Demirel* [30 Sep. 1987]
- \* interpr. of **Dec. 1/80** [Art. 7 + 12]
- ☞ C-221/11 *Demirkan* [24 Sep. 2013]
- \* interpr. of **Protocol** [Art. 41(1)]
- \* *The freedom to 'provide services' does not encompass the freedom to 'receive' services in other EU Member States.*
- ☞ C-256/11 *Dereci et al.* [15 Nov. 2011]
- \* interpr. of **Dec. 1/80** [Art. 13]
- \* *Right of residence of nationals of third countries who are family members of Union citizens - Refusal based on the citizen's failure to exercise the right to freedom of movement - Possible difference in treatment compared with EU citizens who have exercised their right to freedom of movement - EEC-Turkey Association Agreement - Article 13 of Decision No 1/80 of the Association Council - Article 41 of the Additional Protocol - 'Standstill' clauses.*
- ☞ C-325/05 *Derin* [18 July 2007]
- \* interpr. of **Dec. 1/80** [Art. 6, 7 and 14]
- ☞ C-383/03 *Dogan (Ergül)* [7 July 2005]
- \* interpr. of **Dec. 1/80** [Art. 6(1) + (2)]

- New**
- ☞ C-138/13 *Dogan (Naime)* [10 July 2014]
  - \* interpr. of **Protocol** [Art. 41(1)]
  - \* *The language requirement abroad is not in compliance with the standstill clauses of the Association Agreement. Although the question was also raised whether this requirement is in compliance with the Family Reunification Dir., the Court did not answer that question.*
  - ☞ C-136/03 *Dörr & Unal* [2 June 2005]
  - \* interpr. of **Dec. 1/80** [Art. 6(1) + 14(1)]
  - ☞ C-451/11 *Dülger* [19 July 2012]
  - \* interpr. of **Dec. 1/80** [Art. 7]
  - \* *Art. 7 is also applicable to family members of Turkish nationals who can rely on the Regulation, who don't have the Turkish nationality themselves, but instead a nationality from a third country.*
  - ☞ C-386/95 *Eker* [29 May 1997]
  - \* interpr. of **Dec. 1/80** [Art. 6(1)]
  - ☞ C-453/07 *Er* [25 Sep. 2008]
  - \* interpr. of **Dec. 1/80** [Art. 7]
  - ☞ C-420/08 *Erdil* [27 Jan. 2012] (deleted)
  - \* interpr. of **Dec. 1/80** [deleted]
  - \* *Case withdrawn because of judgment C-371/08 (Ziebell). Art. 14(1) of Dec. 1/80 does not have the same scope as art. 28(3)(a) of the Directive on Free Movement.*
  - ☞ C-329/97 *Ergat* [16 Mar. 2000]
  - \* interpr. of **Dec. 1/80** [Art. 7]
  - ☞ C-355/93 *Eroglu* [5 Oct. 1994]
  - \* interpr. of **Dec. 1/80** [Art. 6(1)]
  - ☞ C-98/96 *Ertanir* [30 Sep. 1997]
  - \* interpr. of **Dec. 1/80** [Art. 6(1) + 6(3)]
  
  - New**
  - ☞ C-91/13 *Essent* [11 Sep. 2014]
  - \* interpr. of **Dec. 1/80** [Art. 13]
  - \* *The posting by a German company of Turkish workers in the Netherlands to work in the Netherlands is not affected by the standstill-clauses. However, this situation falls within the scope of art. 56 and 57 TFEU precluding such making available is subject to the condition that those workers have been issued with work permits.*
  - ☞ C-65/98 *Eyüp* [22 June 2000]
  - \* interpr. of **Dec. 1/80** [Art. 7]
  - ☞ C-14/09 *Genc* [4 Feb. 2010]
  - \* interpr. of **Dec. 1/80** [Art. 6(1)]
  - \* *On the determining criteria of the concept worker and the applicability of these criteria on both EU and Turkish workers.*
  - ☞ C-268/11 *Gühlbahce* [8 Nov. 2012]
  - \* interpr. of **Dec. 1/80** [Art. 6(1) + 10]
  - \* *A MS cannot withdraw the residence permit of a Turkish employee with retroactive effect.*
  - ☞ C-36/96 *Günaydin* [30 Sep. 1997]
  - \* interpr. of **Dec. 1/80** [Art. 6(1)]
  - ☞ C-374/03 *Gürol* [7 July 2005]
  - \* interpr. of **Dec. 1/80** [Art. 9]
  - ☞ C-4/05 *Güzeli* [26 Oct. 2006]
  - \* interpr. of **Dec. 1/80** [Art. 10(1)]
  - ☞ C-351/95 *Kadiman* [17 Apr. 1997]
  - \* interpr. of **Dec. 1/80** [Art. 7]
  - ☞ C-7/10 & C-9/10 *Kahveci & Inan* [29 Mar. 2012]
  - \* interpr. of **Dec. 1/80** [Art. 7]

- \* *The members of the family of a Turkish worker duly registered as belonging to the labour force of a Member State can still invoke that provision once that worker has acquired the nationality of the host Member State while retaining his Turkish nationality.*
- ☞ C-285/95 *Kol* [5 June 1997]
- \* interpr. of **Dec. 1/80** [Art. 6(1)]
- ☞ C-188/00 *Kurz (Yuze)* [19 Nov. 2002]
- \* interpr. of **Dec. 1/80** [Art. 6(1) + 7]
- ☞ C-237/91 *Kus* [16 Dec. 1992]
- \* interpr. of **Dec. 1/80** [Art. 6(1) + 6(3)]
- ☞ C-303/08 *Metin Bozkurt* [22 Dec. 2010]
- \* interpr. of **Dec. 1/80** [Art. 7 + 14(1)]
- \* *Art. 7 means that a Turkish national who enjoys certain rights, does not lose those rights on account of his divorce, which took place after those rights were acquired. By contrast, Art. 14(1) does not preclude a measure ordering the expulsion of a Turkish national who has been convicted of criminal offences, provided that his personal conduct constitutes a present, genuine and sufficiently serious threat to a fundamental interest of society. It is for the competent national court to assess whether that is the case in the main proceedings.*
- ☞ C-340/97 *Nazli* [10 Feb. 2000]
- \* interpr. of **Dec. 1/80** [Art. 6(1) + 14(1)]
- ☞ C-294/06 *Payir* [24 Jan. 2008]
- \* interpr. of **Dec. 1/80** [Art. 6(1)]
- ☞ C-484/07 *Pehlivan* [16 June 2011]
- \* interpr. of **Dec. 1/80** [Art. 7]
- \* *Family member marries in first 3 years but continues to live with Turkish worker. Art. 7 precludes legislation under which a family member properly authorised to join a Turkish migrant worker who is already duly registered as belonging to the labour force of that State loses the enjoyment of the rights based on family reunification under that provision for the reason only that, having attained majority, he or she gets married, even where he or she continues to live with that worker during the first three years of his or her residence in the host Member State.*
- ☞ C-349/06 *Polat* [4 Oct. 2007]
- \* interpr. of **Dec. 1/80** [Art. 7 + 14]
- ☞ C-242/06 *Sahin* [17 Sep. 2009]
- \* interpr. of **Dec. 1/80** [Art. 13]
- ☞ C-37/98 *Savas* [11 May 2000]
- \* interpr. of **Protocol** [Art. 41(1)]
- ☞ C-230/03 *Sedef* [10 Jan. 2006]
- \* interpr. of **Dec. 1/80** [Art. 6]
- ☞ C-192/89 *Sevince* [20 Sep. 1990]
- \* interpr. of **Dec. 1/80** [Art. 6(1) + 13]
- ☞ C-228/06 *Soysal* [19 Feb. 2009]
- \* interpr. of **Protocol** [Art. 41(1)]
- ☞ C-171/95 *Tetik* [23 Jan. 1997]
- \* interpr. of **Dec. 1/80** [Art. 6(1)]
- ☞ C-300/09 & C-301/09 *Toprak/Oguz* [9 Dec. 2010]
- \* interpr. of **Dec. 1/80** [Art. 13]
- \* *On the reference date regarding the prohibition to introduce new restrictions for Turkish workers and their family members.*
- ☞ C-502/04 *Torun* [16 Feb. 2006]
- \* interpr. of **Dec. 1/80** [Art. 7]
- ☞ C-16/05 *Tum & Dari* [20 Sep. 2007]
- \* interpr. of **Protocol** [Art. 41(1)]

- ☞ C-186/10 *Tural Oguz* [21 July 2011]
- \* interpr. of **Protocol** [Art. 41(1)]
- \* *Article 41(1) must be interpreted as meaning that it may be relied on by a Turkish national who, having leave to remain in a Member State on condition that he does not engage in any business or profession, nevertheless enters into self-employment in breach of that condition and later applies to the national authorities for further leave to remain on the basis of the business which he has meanwhile established.*
  
- ☞ C-187/10 *Unal* [29 Sep. 2011]
- \* interpr. of **Dec. 1/80** [Art. 6(1)]
- \* *Art. 6(1) must be interpreted as precluding the competent national authorities from withdrawing the residence permit of a Turkish worker with retroactive effect from the point in time at which there was no longer compliance with the ground on the basis of which his residence permit had been issued under national law if there is no question of fraudulent conduct on the part of that worker and that withdrawal occurs after the expiry of the one-year period of legal employment.*
  
- ☞ C-371/08 *Ziebell or Örnek* [8 Dec. 2011]
- \* interpr. of **Dec. 1/80** [Art. 14(1)]
- \* *Decision No 1/80 does not preclude an expulsion measure based on grounds of public policy from being taken against a Turkish national whose legal status derives from the second indent of the first paragraph of Article 7 of that decision, in so far as the personal conduct of the individual concerned constitutes at present a genuine and sufficiently serious threat affecting a fundamental interest of the society of the host Member State and that measure is indispensable in order to safeguard that interest. It is for the national court to determine, in the light of all the relevant factors relating to the situation of the Turkish national concerned, whether such a measure is lawfully justified in the main proceedings.*

#### 4.4.2 CJEU pending cases on EEC-Turkey Association Agreement

- ☞ C-171/13 *Demirci a.o.*
- \* interpr. of **Dec. 3/80** [Art. 6(1)]
- \* **AG: 10 Jul 2014**
- \* ref. from 'Centrale Raad van Beroep' (Netherlands) 02-04-2013
- \* *Is the decision in the Kahveci & Inan case (C-7/10 and 9/10) on double nationality also applicable in case the person in receipt of a benefit, having both Turkish nationality and the nationality of the MS, no longer lives in the MS?*
  
- ☞ C-176/14 *Van Hauthem*
- \* interpr. of **Dec. 1/80** [Art. 6 + 7]
- \* *Do the terms 'any paid employment of his choice', 'any paid employment of their choice' and 'any offer of employment' also cover all positions in the public service, or do the restrictions referred to in Art. 45(4) TFEU and Art. 28(4) of the EEA Agreement or the restrictions referred to in Art. 11 of Directive 2003/109/EC apply by analogy to the application of those provisions?*

**New**

#### 4.4.3 National Judgments on External Treaties

- ☞ **Netherlands:** Raad van State, 201102803/1/V3 [14 Mar. 2012]
- \* interpretation of *EC-Turkey Assn. Agr. Add. Protocol* Art. 41
- \* <http://cmr.jur.ru.nl/nemis/Netherlands/RaadvanState,2011028031V3.pdf>
- \* *The Standstill clauses preclude a visa requirement for Turkish nationals for a short (less than 3 months) stay. It also precludes visa requirements for self-employed Turkish national or Turkish service providers. The Dutch court refers to several CJEU judgments: C-92/07, Cie. v. Netherlands; C-228/06, Soysal; C-101/05, Skatteverket.*
  
- ☞ **Netherlands:** Centrale Raad van Beroep, LJN: BR4959 [16 Aug. 2011]
- \* interpretation of *EC-Turkey Assn. Agr.*
- \* <http://www.ljn.nl/BR4959>
- \* *The Dutch Court decided that the recently introduced 'civic integration examinations' is in breach with the standstill clauses and therefore do not apply to Turkish nationals.*



## 5 Miscellaneous

### **Lives Lost Report of Parliamentary Assembly of COE**

- \* On 29 Mar. 2012, the Committee on Migration, Refugees and Population of the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe, adopted Resolution 1872 (2012), based on the report: “Lives lost in the Mediterranean Sea: who is responsible?” This report was presented on 29 March 2012 by rapporteur Tineke Strik as a member of the Committee on Migration, Refugees and Population of the Assembly.

The starting point for the resolution and of the report is that at least 1500 people are known to have lost their lives attempting to cross the Mediterranean in 2011. This report however focuses on one particularly harrowing case in which a small boat left Tripoli with 72 people on board and after two weeks at sea drifted back to Libya with only nine survivors. No one went to the aid of this boat, despite a distress call logged by the Italian Maritime Rescue Coordination Centre, which pinpointed the boat’s position.

### **Inquiry started by European Ombudsman on the implementation by Frontex of its fundamental rights decisions**

- \* Letter, 6 March 2012

### **Information Note on references from national courts for a preliminary ruling**

- \* OJ 2011 C 160/01

### **COE Report on Rule 39**

- \* On 9 Nov. 2010, the Committee on Migration, Refugees and Population of the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe, published a report on Rule 39. Preventing Harm to refugees and migrants in extradition and expulsion cases: Rule 39 indications by the European Court of Human Rights.

### **Amendments to Court of Justice Statute and rules of procedure**

- \* OJ 2008 L 24
- \* in effect 1 March 2008
- \* Fast-track system for urgent JHA cases

### **Website**

- \* The site <europeanmigrationlaw.eu> provides legislation and case law on asylum and immigration in Europe.