Newsletter on European Migration Issues for Judges

2019/3

NEMIS

Quarterly update on

- *Legislation and*
- *Jurisprudence*

on

- *EU Migration and*
- *Borders Law*

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

New in this Issue of NEMIS

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. NEMIS does not include jurisprudence on free movement or asylum. We would like to refer to separate Newsletters on these issues: NEAIS, the Newsletter on European Asylum Issues, and NEFIS the Newsletter on European Free Movement Issues.

This Newsletter is part of the CMR Jean Monnet Centre of Excellence Work Program 2018-2021.

Website	http://cmr.jur.ru.nl/nemis
Subscribe	email to c.grutters@jur.ru.nl
ISSN	2212 - 9154

Co-funded by the Erasmus+ Programme of the European Union

CMR
Centre for Migration Law

Contents

Editorial

Welcome to the Third issue of NEMIS in 2019.

We would like to draw your attention to the following

Family Benefit
Two prejudicial questions haven been asked (C-302/19 and C-303/19) by the Corte Suprema di cassazione (Italy) about the meaning of the calculations of a family benefit in the context of the principal of equal treatment in the Single Permit Directive (Dir. 2011/98) and the Long-Term Residents Directive (Dir. 2003/109).

Visa
In *Vethanayagam* (C-680/17) the CJEU ruled that the sponsor is not allowed to bring an appeal in his own name against a decision refusing a visa. However, a combined interpretation of Arts. 8(4)(d) and 32(3) Visa Code according to which an appeal against a decision refusing a visa must be conducted against the representing State, is compatible with the fundamental right to effective judicial protection.

Workers and Family Members
The CJEU has ruled in *A.* (C-8918) that Art. 13 of Dec. 1/80 must be interpreted as meaning that a national measure which makes family reunification between a Turkish worker legally resident in the MS (i.e. Denmark) concerned and his spouse conditional upon their overall attachment to that MS being greater than their overall attachment to a third country, constitutes a 'new restriction', within the meaning of that provision. Such a restriction is unjustified.

Return
The CJEU has been asked four prejudicial questions on the interpretation of the Return Directive. The Dutch Raad van State has asked whether the Return Directive is applicable in the case of the removal of a TCN to a MS in which this TCN has international protection (case of *M.,* C-number unknown).
The German Bundesgerichtshof wants to know in *W.M.* (C-18/19) whether Art. 16(1) precludes national provisions under which custody awaiting deportation may be enforced in an ordinary custodial institution if the foreign national poses a significant threat to the life and limb of others or to significant internal security interests, in which case the detainee awaiting deportation is accommodated separately from prisoners serving criminal sentences?
The German Bundesverwaltungsgericht wants to know in *Westerwaldkreis*, whether an entry ban falls within the scope of the Return Directive if the reasons for this ban are not related to migration. And what is the consequence of lifting a return decision on the legitimacy of the corresponding entry ban?
The Spanish Tribunal Superior de Justicia of Castilla La Mancha has asked whether the Spanish legislation, which penalises illegal stay, is compatible with the Return Directive following the interpretation by the CJEU in Zaizoune (C-38/14).

Nijmegen September 2019, Carolus Grütters

1 Regular Migration

1.1 Regular Migration: Adopted Measures

case law sorted in chronological order

Directive 2009/50 — **Blue Card I**

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

* OJ 2009 L 155/17 — impl. date 19 June 2011

Directive 2003/86 — **Family Reunification**

On the right to Family Reunification

* OJ 2003 L 251/12 — impl. date 3 Oct. 2005

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

CJEU judgments

☞	CJEU C-557/17 ***Y.Z. a.o. v. NL***	14 Mar.	2019	Art. 16(2)(a)
☞	CJEU C-635/17 ***E. v. NL***	13 Mar.	2019	Art. 3(2)(c)+11(2)
☞	CJEU C-257/17 ***C. & A. v. NL***	7 Nov.	2018	Art. 3(3)
☞	CJEU C-484/17 ***K. v. NL***	7 Nov.	2018	Art. 15
☞	CJEU C-380/17 ***K. & B. v. NL***	7 Nov.	2018	Art. 9(2)
☞	CJEU C-550/16 ***A. & S. v. NL***	12 Apr.	2018	Art. 2(f)
☞	CJEU C-558/14 ***Khachab v. ESP***	21 Apr.	2016	Art. 7(1)(c)
☞	CJEU C-153/14 ***K. & A. v. NL***	9 July	2015	Art. 7(2)
☞	CJEU C-338/13 ***Noorzia v. AUT***	17 July	2014	Art. 4(5)
☞	CJEU C-138/13 ***Dogan (Naime) v. GER***	10 July	2014	Art. 7(2)
☞	CJEU C-87/12 ***Ymeraga v. LUX***	8 May	2013	Art. 3(3)
☞	CJEU C-356/11 ***O. & S. v. FIN***	6 Dec.	2012	Art. 7(1)(c)
☞	CJEU C-155/11 ***Imran v. NL***	10 June	2011	Art. 7(2) - no adj.
☞	CJEU C-578/08 ***Chakroun v. NL***	4 Mar.	2010	Art. 7(1)(c)+2(d)
☞	CJEU C-540/03 ***EP v. Council***	27 June	2006	Art. 8

CJEU pending cases

☞	CJEU C-136/19 ***B.M.M. v. BEL***	pending		Art. 4
☞	CJEU C-137/19 ***B.M.O. v. BEL***	pending		Art. 4(1)(c)
☞	CJEU C-250/19 ***B.O.L. v. BEL***	pending		Art. 4+18
☞	CJEU C-133/19 ***B.S. v. BEL***	pending		Art. 4
☞	CJEU C-381/18 ***G.S. v. NL***	pending		Art. 6(2)
☞	CJEU C-519/18 ***T.B. v. HUN***	pending		Art. 10(2)
☞	CJEU C-382/18 ***V.G. v. NL***	pending		Art. 6(1)
☞	CJEU C-706/18 ***X. v. BEL***	pending		Art. 3(5)+5(4)

EFTA judgments

☞	EFTA E-4/11 ***Clauder v. LIE***	26 July	2011	Art. 7(1)

See further: § 1.3

Council Decision 2007/435 — **Integration Fund**

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

Directive 2014/66 — **Intra-Corporate Transferees**

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

* OJ 2014 L 157/1 — impl. date 29 Nov. 2016

Directive 2003/109 — **Long-Term Residents**

Concerning the status of TCNs who are long-term residents

* OJ 2004 L 16/44 — impl. date 23 Jan. 2006

* amended by Dir. 2011/51

CJEU judgments

☞	CJEU C-557/17 ***Y.Z. a.o. v. NL***	14 Mar.	2019	Art. 9(1)(a)
☞	CJEU C-636/16 ***Lopez Pastuzano v. ESP***	7 Dec.	2017	Art. 12
☞	CJEU C-309/14 ***CGIL v. ITA***	2 Sep.	2015	
☞	CJEU C-579/13 ***P. & S. v. NL***	4 June	2015	Art. 5+11

☞	CJEU C-311/13 ***Tümer v. NL***	5 Nov.	2014	
☞	CJEU C-469/13 ***Tahir v. ITA***	17 July	2014	Art. 7(1)+13
☞	CJEU C-40/11 ***Iida v. GER***	8 Nov.	2012	Art. 7(1)
☞	CJEU C-502/10 ***Singh v. NL***	18 Oct.	2012	Art. 3(2)(e)
☞	CJEU C-508/10 ***Com. v. NL***	26 Apr.	2012	
☞	CJEU C-571/10 ***Servet Kamberaj v. ITA***	24 Apr.	2012	Art. 11(1)(d)

CJEU pending cases

New ☞	CJEU C-303/19 ***V.R. v. ITA***	pending		Art. 11(1)(d)
☞	CJEU C-302/18 ***X. v. BEL***	pending		Art. 5(1)(a)

See further: § 1.3

Directive 2011/51 — **Long-Term Residents ext.**

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

Council Decision 2006/688 — **Mutual Information**

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

* OJ 2006 L 283/40 — UK, IRL opt in

Directive 2005/71 — **Researchers**

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

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

* Directive is replaced by Dir. 2016/801 Researchers and Students

Recommendation 762/2005 — **Researchers**

To facilitate the admission of TCNs to carry out scientific research

* OJ 2005 L 289/26

Directive 2016/801 — **Researchers and Students**

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

* OJ 2016 L 132/21 (11-05-2016) — impl. date 24 May 2018

* This directive replaces both Dir 2005/71 on Researchers and Dir 2004/114 on Students

Regulation 1030/2002 — **Residence Permit Format**

Laying down a uniform format for residence permits for TCNs

* OJ 2002 L 157/1 — impl. date 15 June 2002 — UK opt in

amd by Reg. 330/2008 (OJ 2008 L 115/1)

amd by Reg. 1954/2017 (OJ 2017 L 286/9)

Directive 2014/36 — **Seasonal Workers**

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

Directive 2011/98 — **Single Permit**

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 (24 Dec. 2011) — impl. date 25 Dec. 2013

CJEU judgments

☞	CJEU C-449/16 ***Martinez Silva v. ITA***	21 June	2017	Art. 12(1)(e)

CJEU pending cases

New ☞	CJEU C-302/19 ***W.S. v. ITA***	pending		Art. 12(1)(e)

See further: § 1.3

Regulation 859/2003 — **Social Security TCN I**

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

* OJ 2003 L 124/1 — UK, IRL opt in

* Replaced by Reg 1231/2010: Social Security TCN II

CJEU judgments

☞	CJEU C-465/14 ***Wieland & Rothwangl v. NL***	27 Oct.	2016	Art. 1
☞	CJEU C-247/09 ***Xhymshiti v. GER***	18 Nov.	2010	

See further: § 1.3

Regulation 1231/2010 — **Social Security TCN II**

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

* Replacing Reg. 859/2003 on Social Security TCN

CJEU judgments

☞	CJEU C-477/17 ***Balandin v. NL***	24 Jan.	2019	Art. 1

See further: § 1.3

Directive 2004/114 — **Students**

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

* Directive is replaced by Dir. 2016/801 Researchers and Students

CJEU judgments

☞	CJEU C-544/15 ***Fahimian v. GER***	4 Apr.	2017	Art. 6(1)(d)
☞	CJEU C-491/13 ***Ben Alaya v. GER***	10 Sep.	2014	Art. 6+7
☞	CJEU C-15/11 ***Sommer v. AUT***	21 June	2012	Art. 17(3)
☞	CJEU C-294/06 ***Payir v. UK***	24 Nov.	2008	

See further: § 1.3

ECHR — **Family - Marriage - Discriminiation**

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

Art. 8 Family Life

Art. 12 Right to Marry

Art. 14 Prohibition of Discrimination

* ETS 005 (4 November 1950) — impl. date 31 Aug. 1954

ECtHR Judgments

☞	ECtHR 23270/16 ***Abokar v. SWE***	14 May	2019	Art. 8
☞	ECtHR 23887/16 ***I.M. v. CH***	9 Apr.	2019	Art. 8
☞	ECtHR 76550/13 ***Saber a.o. v. SP***	18 Dec.	2018	Art. 8
☞	ECtHR 42517/15 ***Yurdaer v. DK***	20 Nov.	2018	Art. 8
☞	ECtHR 25593/14 ***Assem Hassan v. DK***	23 Oct.	2018	Art. 8
☞	ECtHR 7841/14 ***Levakovic v. DK***	23 Oct.	2018	Art. 8
☞	ECtHR 23038/15 ***Gaspar v. RUS***	12 June	2018	Art. 8
☞	ECtHR 47781/10 ***Zezev v. RUS***	12 June	2018	Art. 8
☞	ECtHR 32248/12 ***Ibrogimov v. RUS***	15 May	2018	Art. 8+14
☞	ECtHR 63311/14 ***Hoti v. CRO***	26 Apr.	2018	Art. 8
☞	ECtHR 41215/14 ***Ndidi v. UK***	14 Sep.	2017	Art. 8
☞	ECtHR 33809/15 ***Alam v. DK***	29 June	2017	Art. 8
☞	ECtHR 41697/12 ***Krasniqi v. AUS***	25 Apr.	2017	Art. 8
☞	ECtHR 31183/13 ***Abuhmaid v. UKR***	12 Jan.	2017	Art. 8+13
☞	ECtHR 77063/11 ***Salem v. DK***	1 Dec.	2016	Art. 8
☞	ECtHR 56971/10 ***El Ghatet v. CH***	8 Nov.	2016	Art. 8
☞	ECtHR 7994/14 ***Ustinova v. RUS***	8 Nov.	2016	Art. 8
☞	ECtHR 38030/12 ***Khan v. GER***	23 Sep.	2016	Art. 8
☞	ECtHR 76136/12 ***Ramadan v. MAL***	21 June	2016	Art. 8
☞	ECtHR 38590/10 ***Biao v. DK***	24 May	2016	Art. 8+14
☞	ECtHR 12738/10 ***Jeunesse v. NL***	3 Oct.	2014	Art. 8
☞	ECtHR 32504/11 ***Kaplan a.o. v. NO***	24 July	2014	Art. 8
☞	ECtHR 52701/09 ***Mugenzi v. FR***	10 July	2014	Art. 8
☞	ECtHR 17120/09 ***Dhahbi v. IT***	8 Apr.	2014	Art. 6+8+14
☞	ECtHR 52166/09 ***Hasanbasic v. CH***	11 June	2013	Art. 8
☞	ECtHR 12020/09 ***Udeh v. CH***	16 Apr.	2013	Art. 8
☞	ECtHR 22689/07 ***De Souza Ribeiro v. UK***	13 Dec.	2012	Art. 8+13
☞	ECtHR 47017/09 ***Butt v. NO***	4 Dec.	2012	Art. 8
☞	ECtHR 22341/09 ***Hode and Abdi v. UK***	6 Nov.	2012	Art. 8+14
☞	ECtHR 26940/10 ***Antwi v. NOR***	14 Feb.	2012	Art. 8
☞	ECtHR 22251/07 ***G.R. v. NL***	10 Jan.	2012	Art. 8+13
☞	ECtHR 8000/08 ***A.A. v. UK***	20 Sep.	2011	Art. 8
☞	ECtHR 55597/09 ***Nunez v. NO***	28 June	2011	Art. 8
☞	ECtHR 38058/09 ***Osman v. DK***	14 June	2011	Art. 8
☞	ECtHR 34848/07 ***O'Donoghue v. UK***	14 Dec.	2010	Art. 12+14
☞	ECtHR 41615/07 ***Neulinger v. CH***	6 July	2010	Art. 8
☞	ECtHR 1638/03 ***Maslov v. AU***	22 Mar.	2007	Art. 8
☞	ECtHR 46410/99 ***Üner v. NL***	18 Oct.	2006	Art. 8
☞	ECtHR 54273/00 ***Boultif v. CH***	2 Aug.	2001	Art. 8

See further: § 1.3

UN Convention
CRC
Convention on the Rights of the Child
Art. 10 Family Life
* 1577 UNTS 27531 impl. date 2 Sep. 1990
* Optional Communications Protocol that allows for individual complaints entered into force 14-4-2014

CRC views
☞ CRC C/79/DR/12/2017 ***C.E. v. BEL*** 27 Sep. 2018 Art. 10
See further: § 1.3

1.2 Regular Migration: Proposed Measures

Directive **Blue Card II**
On the conditions of entry and residence of third-country nationals for the purposes of highly skilled employment.
* COM (2016) 378, 7 June 2016
* Recast of Blue Card I (2009/50). Council and EP negotiating

1.3 Regular Migration: Jurisprudence

case law sorted in alphabetical order

1.3.1 CJEU Judgments on Regular Migration

☞ CJEU C-550/16 ***A. & S. v. NL*** 12 Apr. 2018
* interpr. of Dir. 2003/86 Family Reunification Art. 2(f) ECLI:EU:C:2018:248
ref. from Rechtbank Den Haag (zp) Amsterdam, NL, 31 Oct. 2016
* *Art. 2(f) (in conjunction with Art. 10(3)(a)) must be interpreted as meaning that a TCN or stateless person who is below the age of 18 at the time of his or her entry into the territory of a MS and of the introduction of his or her asylum application in that State, but who, in the course of the asylum procedure, attains the age of majority and is thereafter granted refugee status must be regarded as a 'minor' for the purposes of that provision.*

☞ CJEU C-491/13 ***Ben Alaya v. Germany*** 10 Sep. 2014
* interpr. of Dir. 2004/114 Students Art. 6+7 ECLI:EU:C:2014:2187
ref. from Verwaltungsgericht Berlin, Germany, 13 Sep. 2013
* *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-257/17 ***C. & A. v. NL*** 7 Nov. 2018
* interpr. of Dir. 2003/86 Family Reunification Art. 3(3) ECLI:EU:C:2018:876
ref. from Raad van State, NL, 15 May 2017
* AG: 27 Jun 2018
* *Article 15(1) and (4) does not preclude national legislation which permits an application for an autonomous residence permit, lodged by a TCN who has resided over five years in a MS by virtue of family reunification, to be rejected on the ground that he has not shown that he has passed a civic integration test on the language and society of that MS provided that the detailed rules for the requirement to pass that examination do not go beyond what is necessary to attain the objective of facilitating the integration of those third country nationals.*
Article 15(1) and (4) does not preclude national legislation which provides that an autonomous residence permit cannot be issued earlier than the date on which it was applied for.

☞ CJEU C-477/17 ***Balandin v. NL*** 24 Jan. 2019
* interpr. of Reg. 1231/2010 Social Security TCN II Art. 1 ECLI:EU:C:2019:60
ref. from Centrale Raad van Beroep, NL, 4 Aug. 2017
* *Article 1 must be interpreted as meaning that third country nationals, who temporarily reside and work in different Member States in the service of an employer established in a Member State, may rely on the coordination rules (laid down by Reg. 883/2004 and Reg. 987/2009 and Reg. 883/2004), in order to determine the social security legislation to which they are subject, provided that they are legally staying and working in the territory of the Member States.*

☞ CJEU C-309/14 ***CGIL v. Italy*** 2 Sep. 2015
* interpr. of Dir. 2003/109 Long-Term Residents ECLI:EU:C:2015:523
ref. from Tribunale Amministrativo Regionale per il Lazio, Italy, 30 June 2014
* *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. Such a fee is disproportionate in the light of the objective pursued by the directive and is liable to create an obstacle to the exercise of the rights conferred by the directive.*

☞ CJEU C-578/08 — ***Chakroun v. NL*** — 4 Mar. 2010
* interpr. of Dir. 2003/86 — Family Reunification Art. 7(1)(c)+2(d) — ECLI:EU:C:2010:117
ref. from Raad van State, NL, 29 Dec. 2008

* *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-508/10 — ***Com. v. NL*** — 26 Apr. 2012
* incor. appl. of Dir. 2003/109 — Long-Term Residents — ECLI:EU:C:2012:243
ref. from European Commission, EU, 25 Oct. 2010

* *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-138/13 — ***Dogan (Naime) v. Germany*** — 10 July 2014
* interpr. of Dir. 2003/86 — Family Reunification Art. 7(2) — ECLI:EU:C:2014:2066
ref. from Verwaltungsgericht Berlin, Germany, 19 Mar. 2013

* *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-635/17 — ***E. v. NL*** — 13 Mar. 2019
* interpr. of Dir. 2003/86 — Family Reunification Art. 3(2)(c)+11(2) — ECLI:EU:C:2019:192
ref. from Rechtbank Den Haag (zp) Haarlem, NL, 14 Nov. 2017

* *The CJEU has jurisdiction, on the basis of Art. 267 TFEU, to interpret Article 11(2) of Council Directive 2003/86 in a situation where a national court is called upon to rule on an application for family reunification lodged by a beneficiary of subsidiary protection, if that provision was made directly and unconditionally applicable to such a situation under national law.*
Art. 11(2) of Directive 2003/86 must be interpreted as precluding, in circumstances such as those at issue in the main proceedings, in which an application for family reunification has been lodged by a sponsor benefiting from subsidiary protection in favour of a minor of whom she is the aunt and allegedly the guardian, and who resides as a refugee and without family ties in a third country, that application from being rejected solely on the ground that the sponsor has not provided official documentary evidence of the death of the minor's biological parents and, consequently, that she has an actual family relationship with him, and that the explanation given by the sponsor to justify her inability to provide such evidence has been deemed implausible by the competent authorities solely on the basis of the general information available concerning the situation in the country of origin, without taking into consideration the specific circumstances of the sponsor and the minor and the particular difficulties they have encountered, according to their testimony, before and after fleeing their country of origin.

☞ CJEU C-540/03 — ***EP v. Council*** — 27 June 2006
* interpr. of Dir. 2003/86 — Family Reunification Art. 8 — ECLI:EU:C:2006:429
ref. from European Commission, EU, 22 Dec. 2013

* *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-544/15 — ***Fahimian v. Germany*** — 4 Apr. 2017
* interpr. of Dir. 2004/114 — Students Art. 6(1)(d) — ECLI:EU:C:2017:255
ref. from Verwaltungsgericht Berlin, Germany, 19 Oct. 2015

* *Art. 6(1)(d) is to be interpreted as meaning that the competent national authorities, where a third country national has applied to them for a visa for study purposes, have a wide discretion in ascertaining, in the light of all the relevant elements of the situation of that national, whether he represents a threat, if only potential, to public security. That provision must also be interpreted as not precluding the competent national authorities from refusing to admit to the territory of the Member State concerned, for study purposes, a third country national who holds a degree from a university which is the subject of EU restrictive measures because of its large scale involvement with the Iranian Government in military or related fields, and who plans to carry out research in that Member State in a field that is sensitive for public security, if the elements available to those authorities give reason to fear that the knowledge acquired by that person during his research may subsequently be used for purposes contrary to public security. It is for the national court hearing an action brought against the decision of the competent national*

authorities to refuse to grant the visa sought to ascertain whether that decision is based on sufficient grounds and a sufficiently solid factual basis.

☞ CJEU C-40/11 — ***Iida v. Germany*** — 8 Nov. 2012
* interpr. of Dir. 2003/109 — Long-Term Residents Art. 7(1) — ECLI:EU:C:2012:691
ref. from Verwaltungsgerichtshof Baden-Württemberg, Germany, 28 Jan. 2011

* *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 v. NL*** — 10 June 2011
* interpr. of Dir. 2003/86 — Family Reunification Art. 7(2) - no adj. — ECLI:EU:C:2011:387
ref. from Rechtbank Den Haag (zp) Zwolle, NL, 31 Mar. 2011

* *The Commission took the position that Art. 7(2) does not allow MSs 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. 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-484/17 — ***K. v. NL*** — 7 Nov. 2018
* interpr. of Dir. 2003/86 — Family Reunification Art. 15 — ECLI:EU:C:2018:878
ref. from Raad van State, NL, 10 Aug. 2017

* *Article 15(1) and (4) does not preclude national legislation, which permits an application for an autonomous residence permit, lodged by a TCN who has resided over five years in a MS by virtue of family reunification, to be rejected on the ground that he has not shown that he has passed a civic integration test on the language and society of that MS provided that the detailed rules for the requirement to pass that examination do not go beyond what is necessary to attain the objective of facilitating the integration of those third country nationals, which is for the referring court to ascertain.*

☞ CJEU C-153/14 — ***K. & A. v. NL*** — 9 July 2015
* interpr. of Dir. 2003/86 — Family Reunification Art. 7(2) — ECLI:EU:C:2015:523
ref. from Raad van State, NL, 3 Apr. 2014

* *Member States may require TCNs to pass a civic integration examination, which consists in an assessment of basic knowledge both of the language of the Member State concerned and of its society and which entails the payment of various costs, before authorising that national's entry into and residence in the territory of the Member State for the purposes of family reunification, provided that the conditions of application of such a requirement do not make it impossible or excessively difficult to exercise the right to family reunification.*
In circumstances such as those of the cases in the main proceedings, in so far as they do not allow regard to be had to special circumstances objectively forming an obstacle to the applicants passing the examination and in so far as they set the fees relating to such an examination at too high a level, those conditions make the exercise of the right to family reunification impossible or excessively difficult.

☞ CJEU C-380/17 — ***K. & B. v. NL*** — 7 Nov. 2018
* interpr. of Dir. 2003/86 — Family Reunification Art. 9(2) — ECLI:EU:C:2018:877
ref. from Raad van State, NL, 26 June 2017

* AG: 27 Jun 2018

* *Article 12(1) does not preclude national legislation which permits an application for family reunification lodged on behalf of a member of a refugee's family, on the basis of the more favourable provisions for refugees of Chapter V of that directive, to be rejected on the ground that that application was lodged more than three months after the sponsor was granted refugee status, whilst affording the possibility of lodging a fresh application under a different set of rules provided that that legislation:*
(a) lays down that such a ground of refusal cannot apply to situations in which particular circumstances render the late submission of the initial application objectively excusable;
(b) lays down that the persons concerned are to be fully informed of the consequences of the decision rejecting their initial application and of the measures which they can take to assert their rights to family reunification effectively; and
(c) ensures that sponsors recognised as refugees continue to benefit from the more favourable conditions for the exercise of the right to family reunification applicable to refugees, specified in Articles 10 and 11 or in Article 12(2) of the directive.

☞ CJEU C-558/14 — ***Khachab v. Spain*** — 21 Apr. 2016
* interpr. of Dir. 2003/86 — Family Reunification Art. 7(1)(c) — ECLI:EU:C:2016:285
ref. from Tribunal Superior de Justicia del Pais Vasco, Spain, 5 Dec. 2014

* *Art. 7(1)(c) must be interpreted as allowing the competent authorities of a MS to refuse an application for family reunification on the basis of a prospective assessment of the likelihood of the sponsor retaining, or failing to retain, the necessary stable and regular resources which are sufficient to maintain himself and the members of his family, without recourse to the social assistance system of that MS, in the year following the date of submission of that application, that assessment being based on the pattern of the sponsor's income in the six months preceding that date.*

☞ CJEU C-636/16 — ***Lopez Pastuzano v. Spain*** — 7 Dec. 2017
* interpr. of Dir. 2003/109 — Long-Term Residents Art. 12 — ECLI:EU:C:2017:949
ref. from Juzgado de lo Contencioso-Adm. of Pamplona, Spain, 9 Dec. 2016

* *The CJEU declares that the LTR directive precludes legislation of a MS which, as interpreted by some domestic courts, does not provide for the application of the requirements of protection against the expulsion of a third-*

country national who is a long-term resident to all administrative expulsion decisions, regardless of the legal nature of that measure or of the detailed rules governing it.

☞ CJEU C-449/16 — ***Martinez Silva v. Italy*** — 21 June 2017
* interpr. of Dir. 2011/98 — Single Permit Art. 12(1)(e) — ECLI:EU:C:2017:485
ref. from Corte D'Appello Di Genova, Italy, 11 Aug. 2016
* *Article 12 must be interpreted as precluding national legislation, under which a TCN holding a Single Permit cannot receive a benefit such as the benefit for households having at least three minor children as established by Legge n. 448 (national Italian legislation).*

☞ CJEU C-338/13 — ***Noorzia v. Austria*** — 17 July 2014
* interpr. of Dir. 2003/86 — Family Reunification Art. 4(5) — ECLI:EU:C:2014:2092
ref. from Verwaltungsgerichtshof, Austria, 20 June 2013
* *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. & S. v. Finland*** — 6 Dec. 2012
* interpr. of Dir. 2003/86 — Family Reunification Art. 7(1)(c) — ECLI:EU:C:2012:776
ref. from Korkein hallinto-oikeus, Finland, 7 July 2011
* *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-579/13 — ***P. & S. v. NL*** — 4 June 2015
* interpr. of Dir. 2003/109 — Long-Term Residents Art. 5+11 — ECLI:EU:C:2015:369
ref. from Centrale Raad van Beroep, NL, 15 Nov. 2012
* *Article 5(2) and Article 11(1) do not preclude national legislation, such as that at issue in the main proceedings, which imposes on TCNs who already possess long-term resident status the obligation to pass a civic integration examination, under pain of a fine, provided that the means of implementing that obligation are not liable to jeopardise the achievement of the objectives pursued by that directive, which it is for the referring court to determine. Whether the long-term resident status was acquired before or after the obligation to pass a civic integration examination was imposed is irrelevant in that respect.*

☞ CJEU C-294/06 — ***Payir v. UK*** — 24 Nov. 2008
* interpr. of Dir. 2004/114 — Students — ECLI:EU:C:2008:36
ref. from Court of Appeal (England & Wales), UK, 24 Jan. 2008
* *The fact that a Turkish national was granted leave to enter the territory of a MS as an au pair or as a student cannot deprive him of the status of 'worker' and prevent him from being regarded as 'duly registered as belonging to the labour force' of that MS.*

☞ CJEU C-571/10 — ***Servet Kamberaj v. Italy*** — 24 Apr. 2012
* interpr. of Dir. 2003/109 — Long-Term Residents Art. 11(1)(d) — ECLI:EU:C:2012:233
ref. from Tribunale di Bolzano, Italy, 7 Dec. 2010
* *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 v. NL*** — 18 Oct. 2012
* interpr. of Dir. 2003/109 — Long-Term Residents Art. 3(2)(e) — ECLI:EU:C:2012:636
ref. from Raad van State, NL, 20 Oct. 2010
* *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 this Dir.*

☞ CJEU C-15/11 — ***Sommer v. Austria*** — 21 June 2012
* interpr. of Dir. 2004/114 — Students Art. 17(3) — ECLI:EU:C:2012:371
ref. from Verwaltungsgerichtshof, Austria, 12 Jan. 2011
* *The conditions of access to the labour market by Bulgarian students, may not be more restrictive than those set out in the Directive*

☞ CJEU C-469/13 — ***Tahir v. Italy*** — 17 July 2014
* interpr. of Dir. 2003/109 — Long-Term Residents Art. 7(1)+13 — ECLI:EU:C:2014:2094
ref. from Tribunale di Verona, Italy, 30 Aug. 2013
* *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 the LTR Directive 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-311/13 — ***Tümer v. NL*** — 5 Nov. 2014
* interpr. of Dir. 2003/109 — Long-Term Residents — ECLI:EU:C:2014:2337
ref. from Centrale Raad van Beroep, NL, 7 June 2013
* *While the LTR provided for equal treatment of long-term resident TCNs, this 'in no way precludes other EU acts,*

such as' the insolvent employers Directive, "from conferring, subject to different conditions, rights on TCNs with a view to achieving individual objectives of those acts".

☞ CJEU C-465/14 — ***Wieland & Rothwangl v. NL*** — 27 Oct. 2016
* interpr. of Reg. 859/2003 — Social Security TCN I Art. 1 — ECLI:EU:C:2016:820
ref. from Centrale Raad van Beroep, NL, 9 Oct. 2014
* *Article 2(1) and (2) of Regulation 859/2003, must be interpreted as not precluding legislation of a Member State which provides that a period of employment — completed pursuant to the legislation of that Member State by an employed worker who was not a national of a Member State during that period but who, when he requests the payment of an old-age pension, falls within the scope of Article 1 of that regulation — is not to be taken into consideration by that Member State for the determination of that worker's pension rights.*

☞ CJEU C-247/09 — ***Xhymshiti v. Germany*** — 18 Nov. 2010
* interpr. of Reg. 859/2003 — Social Security TCN I — ECLI:EU:C:2010:698
ref. from Finanzgericht Baden-Württemberg, Germany, 7 July 2009
* *In the case in which a national of a non-member country is lawfully resident in a MS of the EU and works in Switzerland, Reg. 859/2003 does not apply to that person in his MS of residence, in so far as that regulation is not among the Community acts mentioned in section A of Annex II to the EU-Switzerland Agreement which the parties to that agreement undertake to apply.*

☞ CJEU C-557/17 — ***Y.Z. a.o. v. NL*** — 14 Mar. 2019
* interpr. of Dir. 2003/86 — Family Reunification Art. 16(2)(a) — ECLI:EU:C:2019:203
ref. from Raad van State, NL, 22 Sep. 2017
* *Art. 16(2)(a) of Dir. 2003/86 (on Family Reunification) must be interpreted as meaning that, where falsified documents were produced for the issuing of residence permits to family members of a third-country national, the fact that those family members did not know of the fraudulent nature of those documents does not preclude the Member State concerned, in application of that provision, from withdrawing those permits. In accordance with Article 17 of that directive, it is however for the competent national authorities to carry out, beforehand, a case-by-case assessment of the situation of those family members, by making a balanced and reasonable assessment of all the interests in play.*

☞ CJEU C-557/17 — ***Y.Z. a.o. v. NL*** — 14 Mar. 2019
* interpr. of Dir. 2003/109 — Long-Term Residents Art. 9(1)(a) — ECLI:EU:C:2019:203
ref. from Raad van State, NL, 22 Sep. 2017
* *Art. 9(1)(a) of Dir. 2003/109 (on Long-Term Residents) must be interpreted as meaning that, where long-term resident status has been granted to third-country nationals on the basis of falsified documents, the fact that those nationals did not know of the fraudulent nature of those documents does not preclude the Member State concerned, in application of that provision, from withdrawing that status.*

☞ CJEU C-87/12 — ***Ymeraga v. Luxembourg*** — 8 May 2013
* interpr. of Dir. 2003/86 — Family Reunification Art. 3(3) — ECLI:EU:C:2013:291
ref. from Cour Administrative, Luxembourg, 20 Feb. 2012
* *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: CJEU 15 Nov. 2011, C-256/11 Dereci, par. 58 in our other newsletter NEFIS).*

1.3.2 CJEU pending cases on Regular Migration

☞ CJEU C-136/19 — ***B.M.M. v. Belgium***
* interpr. of Dir. 2003/86 — Family Reunification Art. 4
ref. from Conseil d'Etat, Belgium, 20 Feb. 2019
* *Must Art. 4 be interpreted as meaning that the sponsor's child may enjoy the right to family reunification when he attains his majority during the judicial proceedings against the decision which refuses him that right and which was taken when he was still a minor?*

☞ CJEU C-137/19 — ***B.M.O. v. Belgium***
* interpr. of Dir. 2003/86 — Family Reunification Art. 4(1)(c)
ref. from Conseil d'Etat, Belgium, 20 Feb. 2019
* *Must Article 4(1)(c) be interpreted as requiring that third country nationals, in order to be classified as 'minor children' within the meaning of that provision, must be 'minors' not only at the time of submitting the application for leave to reside but also at the time when the administration eventually determines that application?*

☞ CJEU C-250/19 — ***B.O.L. v. Belgium***
* interpr. of Dir. 2003/86 — Family Reunification Art. 4+18
ref. from Conseil d'Etat, Belgium, 25 Mar. 2019
* *Must Article 4 be interpreted as meaning that the sponsor's child is able to enjoy the right to family reunification where he becomes an adult during the court proceedings brought against the decision which refuses to grant him that right and was taken when he was still a minor?*

☞ CJEU C-133/19 — ***B.S. v. Belgium***
* interpr. of Dir. 2003/86 — Family Reunification Art. 4
ref. from Conseil d'Etat, Belgium, 19 Feb. 2019

* *Must Article 4 be interpreted as meaning that the sponsor's child is able to enjoy the right to family reunification where he becomes an adult during the court proceedings brought against the decision which refuses to grant him that right and was taken when he was still a minor?*

☞ CJEU C-381/18 ***G.S. v. NL***
* interpr. of Dir. 2003/86 Family Reunification Art. 6(2) ECLI:EU:C:2019:608
ref. from Raad van State, NL, 11 June 2018
* AG: 11 Jul 2019
* *On the issue which criteria should be used in the context of the withdrawal of a residence permit of a family member of a TCN who is sentenced to imprisonment in another MS.*

☞ CJEU C-519/18 ***T.B. v. Hungary***
* interpr. of Dir. 2003/86 Family Reunification Art. 10(2) ECLI:EU:C:2019:681
ref. from Fővárosi Közigazgatási és Munkaügyi Bíróság, Hungary, 7 Aug. 2018
* AG: 5 Sep 2019
* *On the issue what the meaning is of a family member being "dependent" (on the refugee).*

☞ CJEU C-382/18 ***V.G. v. NL***
* interpr. of Dir. 2003/86 Family Reunification Art. 6(1) ECLI:EU:C:2019:608
ref. from Raad van State, NL, 11 June 2018
* AG: 11 Jul 2019
* *On the issue which criteria should be used in the context of the denial of a residence permit of a family member of a TCN who is sentenced to imprisonment in another MS.*

New ☞ CJEU C-303/19 ***V.R. v. Italy***
* interpr. of Dir. 2003/109 Long-Term Residents Art. 11(1)(d)
ref. from Corte Suprema di cassazione, Italy, 11 Apr. 2019
* *Should Art. 11(1)(d) and the principle of equal treatment be interpreted to the effect that they preclude national legislation under which, unlike the provisions laid down for nationals of the MS, the family members of a worker who is a LTR and a citizen of a third country are excluded when determining the members of the family unit, for the purpose of calculating the family unit allowance, where those individuals live in the third country of origin?*

New ☞ CJEU C-302/19 ***W.S. v. Italy***
* interpr. of Dir. 2011/98 Single Permit Art. 12(1)(e)
ref. from Corte Suprema di cassazione, Italy,
* *Should Art. 12(1)(e) and the principle of equal treatment be interpreted to the effect that they preclude national legislation under which, unlike the provisions laid down for nationals of the MS, the family members of a worker with a single permit from a third country are excluded when determining the members of the family unit, for the purpose of calculating the family unit allowance, where those family members live in the third country of origin?*

☞ CJEU C-302/18 ***X. v. Belgium***
* interpr. of Dir. 2003/109 Long-Term Residents Art. 5(1)(a) ECLI:EU:C:2019:469
ref. from Raad voor Vreemdelingenbetwistingen, Belgium, 4 May 2018
* AG: 6 June 2019
* *On the meaning of 'stable, regular and sufficient resources'.*

☞ CJEU C-706/18 ***X. v. Belgium***
* interpr. of Dir. 2003/86 Family Reunification Art. 3(5)+5(4)
ref. from Raad voor Vreemdelingenbetwistingen, Belgium, 14 Nov. 2018
* *Does Dir. 2003/86 preclude national legislation which requires that Article 5(4) of Dir. 2003/86 be interpreted as meaning that the consequence of no decision having been taken by the expiry of the prescribed period is that national authorities are under an obligation to grant, of their own motion, a residence permit to the person concerned, without first establishing that that person in fact satisfies the conditions for residence in Belgium in conformity with EU law?*

1.3.3 EFTA judgments on Regular Migration

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

☞ EFTA E-28/15 ***Yankuba Jabbi v. Norway*** 21 Sep. 2016
* interpr. of Dir. 2004/38 Right of Residence Art. 7(1)(b)+7(2)
* *Where an EEA national, pursuant to Article 7(1)(b) and Article 7(2) of Directive 2004/38/EC, has created or strengthened a family life with a third country national during genuine residence in an EEA State other than that of which he is a national, the provisions of that directive will apply by analogy where that EEA national returns with the family member to his home State.*

1.3.4 ECtHR Judgments on Regular Migration

☞ ECtHR 8000/08 ***A.A. v. UK*** 20 Sep. 2011
* violation of ECHR: Art. 8 ECLI:CE:ECHR:2011:0920JUD000800008
* *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 UK.*

☞ ECtHR 23270/16 ***Abokar v. SWE*** 14 May 2019
* no violation of ECHR: Art. 8 ECLI:CE:ECHR:2019:0514JUD002327016
* *The applicant is a Somali national who was born in 1986. He was granted refugee status and a residence permit in Italy in 2013. Also in 2013, he is married in Sweden to A who holds a permanent resident status in Sweden. The couple has two children. The applicant applies under a different name also for asylum in Sweden. That request, however, is denied and Sweden sends him back to Italy.*
Subsequently, the applicant applies for a regular residence permit based on family reunification in Sweden. Due to using false IDs the Swedish authorities conclude that the applicant could not make his identity probable. Also, the applicant could not prove that they had been living together prior to his moving to Sweden. As a result his application was denied.
The Court finds that the Swedish authorities have not failed to strike a fair balance between the applicant's interests, on the one hand, and the State's interest in effective implementation of immigration control, on the other. The Court further notes that since both the applicant and his wife have been granted residence permits in member States of the European Union (Italy and Sweden), the family can easily travel between Italy and Sweden and stay for longer periods in either of those countries.

☞ ECtHR 31183/13 ***Abuhmaid v. UKR*** 12 Jan. 2017
* no violation of ECHR: Art. 8+13 ECLI:CE:ECHR:2017:0112JUD003118313
* *The applicant is a Palestinian residing in Ukraine for over twenty years. In 2010 the temporary residence permit expired. Since then, the applicant has applied for asylum unsuccessfully. The Court found that the applicant does not face any real or imminent risk of expulsion from Ukraine since his new application for asylum is still being considered and therefore declared this complaint inadmissible.*

☞ ECtHR 33809/15 ***Alam v. DK*** 29 June 2017
* no violation of ECHR: Art. 8 ECLI:CE:ECHR:2017:0629JUD003380915
* *The applicant is a Pakistani national who entered DK in 1984 when she was 2 years old. She has two children. In 2013 she is convicted of murder, aggravated robbery and arson to life imprisonment. She was also expelled from DK with a life-long entry ban. The Court states that it has no reason to call into question the conclusions reached by the domestic courts on the basis of the balancing exercise which they carried out. Those conclusions were neither arbitrary nor manifestly unreasonable. The Court is thus satisfied that the interference with the applicant's private and family life was supported by relevant and sufficient reasons and that her expulsion would not be disproportionate given all the circumstances of the case.*

☞ ECtHR 26940/10 ***Antwi v. NOR*** 14 Feb. 2012
* no violation of ECHR: Art. 8 ECLI:CE:ECHR:2012:0214JUD002694010
* *A case similar to Nunez (ECtHR 28 June 2011) except that the judgment is not unanimous (2 dissenting opinions). Mr Antwi from Ghana migrates in 1988 to Germany on a false Portuguese passport. In Germany he meets his future wife (also from Ghana) who lives in Norway and is naturalised to Norwegian nationality. Mr Antwi moves to Norway to live with her and their first child is born in 2001 in Norway. In 2005 the parents marry in Ghana and subsequently it is discovered that mr Antwi travels on a false passport. In Norway mr Antwi goes to trial and is expelled to Ghana with a five year re-entry ban. The Court does not find that the Norwegian authorities acted arbitrarily or otherwise transgressed the margin of appreciation which should be accorded to it in this area when seeking to strike a fair balance between its public interest in ensuring effective immigration control, on the one hand, and the applicants' need that the first applicant be able to remain in Norway, on the other hand.*

☞ ECtHR 25593/14 ***Assem Hassan v. DK*** 23 Oct. 2018
* no violation of ECHR: Art. 8 ECLI:CE:ECHR:2018:1023JUD002559314
* *The case concerned the expulsion from Denmark of a Jordanian national, who has six children of Danish nationality. He was deported in 2014 following several convictions for drugs offences.*
The Court was not convinced that the best interests of the applicant's six children had been so adversely affected by his deportation that they should outweigh the other criteria to be taken into account, such as the prevention of disorder or crime.

☞ ECtHR 38590/10 ***Biao v. DK*** 24 May 2016
* violation of ECHR: Art. 8+14 ECLI:CE:ECHR:2016:0524JUD003859010
* *Initially, the Second Section of the Court decided on 25 March 2014 that there was no violation of Art. 8 in the Danish case where the Danish statutory amendment requires that the spouses' aggregate ties with Denmark has to be stronger than the spouses' aggregate ties with another country. However, after referral, the Grand Chamber reviewed that decision and decided otherwise. The Court ruled that the the so-called attachment requirement (the requirement of both spouses having stronger ties with Denmark than to any other country) is unjustified and constitutes indirect discrimination and therefore a violation of Art 8 and 14 ECHR.*

☞ ECtHR 54273/00 ***Boultif v. CH*** 2 Aug. 2001
* violation of ECHR: Art. 8 ECLI:CE:ECHR:2001:0802JUD005427300
* *Expulsion of one of the spouses is a serious obstacle to family life for the remaining spouse and children in the context of article 8. In this case the ECtHR establishes guiding principles in order to examine whether such a measure is necessary in a democratic society. Relevant criteria are:*
- the nature and seriousness of the offence committed by the applicant;
- the length of the applicant's stay in the country from which he is going to be expelled;

- the time elapsed since the offence was committed as well as the applicant's conduct in that period;
- the nationalities of the various persons concerned;
- the applicant's family situation, such as the length of the marriage;
- and other factors expressing the effectiveness of a couple's family life;
- whether the spouse knew about the offence at the time when he or she entered into a family relationship;
- and whether there are children in the marriage, and if so, their age.
Not least, the Court will also consider the seriousness of the difficulties which the spouse is likely to encounter in the country of origin, though the mere fact that a person might face certain difficulties in accompanying her or his spouse cannot in itself exclude an expulsion.

☞ ECtHR 47017/09 ***Butt v. NO*** 4 Dec. 2012
* violation of ECHR: Art. 8 ECLI:CE:ECHR:2012:1204JUD004701709
* *At the age of 3 and 4, the Butt children enter Norway with their mother from Pakistan in 1989. They receive a residence permit on humanitarian grounds. After a couple of years the mother returns with the children to Pakistan without knowledge of the Norwegian authorities. After a couple years the mother travels - again - back to Norway to continue living there. The children are 10 an 11 years old. When the father of the children wants to live also in Norway, a new investigation shows that the family has lived both in Norway and in Pakistan and their residence permit is withdrawn. However, the expulsion of the children is not carried out. Years later, their deportation is discussed again. The mother has already died and the adult children still do not have any contact with their father in Pakistan. Their ties with Pakistan are so weak and reversely with Norway so strong that their expulsion would entail a violation of art. 8.*

☞ ECtHR 22689/07 ***De Souza Ribeiro v. UK*** 13 Dec. 2012
* violation of ECHR: Art. 8+13 ECLI:CE:ECHR:2012:1213JUD002268907
* *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.*

☞ ECtHR 17120/09 ***Dhahbi v. IT*** 8 Apr. 2014
* violation of ECHR: Art. 6+8+14 ECLI:CE:ECHR:2014:0408JUD001712009
* *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 56971/10 ***El Ghatet v. CH*** 8 Nov. 2016
* violation of ECHR: Art. 8 ECLI:CE:ECHR:2016:1108JUD005697110
* *The applicant is an Egyptian national, who applied for asylum in Switzerland leaving his son behind in Egypt. While his asylum application was rejected, the father obtained a residence permit and after having married a Swiss national also Swiss nationality. The couple have a daughter and eventually divorced. The father's first request for family reunification with his son was accepted in 2003 but eventually his son returned to Egypt. The father's second request for family reunification in 2006 was rejected. According to the Swiss Federal Supreme Court, the applicant's son had closer ties to Egypt where he had been cared for by his mother and grandmother. Moreover, the father should have applied for family reunification immediately after arriving in Switzerland.*
The Court first considers that it would be unreasonable to ask the father to relocate to Egypt to live together with his son there, as this would entail a separation from the father's daughter living in Switzerland. The son had reached the age of 15 when the request for family reunification was lodged and there were no other major threats to his best interests in the country of origin.
Based on these facts, the Court finds that no clear conclusion can be drawn whether or not the applicants' interest in a family reunification outweighed the public interest of the respondent State in controlling the entry of foreigners into its territory. Nevertheless, the Court notes that the domestic court have merely examined the best interest of the child in a brief manner and put forward a rather summary reasoning. As such the child's best interests have not sufficiently been placed at the centre of its balancing exercise. The Court therefore finds a violation of Art. 8.

☞ ECtHR 22251/07 ***G.R. v. NL*** 10 Jan. 2012
* violation of ECHR: Art. 8+13 ECLI:CE:ECHR:2012:0110JUD002225107
* *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 23038/15 ***Gaspar v. RUS*** 12 June 2018
* interpr. of ECHR: Art. 8 ECLI:CE:ECHR:2018:0612JUD002303815

* *Request for referral to the Grand Chamber pending. In this case a residence permit of a Czech national married to a Russian national was withdrawn based on a no further motivated report implicating that the applicant was considered a danger to national security.*

☞ ECtHR 52166/09 ***Hasanbasic v. CH*** 11 June 2013
* violation of ECHR: Art. 8 ECLI:CE:ECHR:2013:0611JUD005216609
* *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 22341/09 ***Hode and Abdi v. UK*** 6 Nov. 2012
* violation of ECHR: Art. 8+14 ECLI:CE:ECHR:2012:1106JUD002234109
* *Discrimination on the basis of date of marriage has no objective and reasonable justification.*

☞ ECtHR 63311/14 ***Hoti v. CRO*** 26 Apr. 2018
* violation of ECHR: Art. 8 ECLI:CE:ECHR:2018:0426JUD006331114
* *The applicant is a stateless person who came to Croatia at the age of seventeen and has lived and worked there for almost forty years. The applicant has filed several requests for Croatian nationality and permanent residence status; these, however, were all denied. The Court does consider that, in the particular circumstances of the applicant's case, the respondent State has not complied with its positive obligation to provide an effective and accessible procedure or a combination of procedures enabling the applicant to have the issues of his further stay and status in Croatia determined with due regard to his private-life interests.*

☞ ECtHR 23887/16 ***I.M. v. CH*** 9 Apr. 2019
* violation of ECHR: Art. 8 ECLI:CE:ECHR:2019:0409JUD002388716
* *The applicant is a Kosovar national who was born in 1964 and has lived in Switzerland since 1993. In 2003 he committed a rape; he was sentenced to two years and three months' imprisonment. Once that conviction had become final, the authorities decided to expel him. The applicant's health worsened over the years: since 2012 his disability rate had stood at 80%. In 2015 his final appeal against the expulsion order was dismissed: the Federal Administrative Court held that the authorities had to be afforded a wide margin of discretion under the subsidiarity principle. Consequently, the applicant lost his disability allowance and was now dependent on his children.*
The ECtHR ruled that the Swiss authorities had only examined the proportionality of the expulsion order superficially, briefly considered the risk of reoffending and mentioned the difficulties which the applicant would have faced on his return to Kosovo. Other aspects had been either overlooked or considered very superficially even though they had been relevant criteria under the Court's case-law, including the solidity of the applicant's social, cultural and family links with the host country and the country of destination, medical evidence, the applicant's situation of dependence on his adult children, the change in the applicant's behaviour twelve years after the commission of the offence, and the impact of his seriously worsening state of health on the risk of his reoffending.

☞ ECtHR 32248/12 ***Ibrogimov v. RUS*** 15 May 2018
* violation of ECHR: Art. 8+14 ECLI:CE:ECHR:2018:0515JUD003224812
* *The applicant was born in Uzbekistan. After the death of this grandfather he wanted to move to his family (father, mother, brother and sister) who already lived in Russia and held Russian nationality. After a mandatory blood test he was found HIV-positive and therefor declared 'undesirable'. The exclusion order was upheld by a District court and in appeal. The ECthR held unanimously that the applicant has been a victim of discrimination on account of his health.*

☞ ECtHR 12738/10 ***Jeunesse v. NL*** 3 Oct. 2014
* violation of ECHR: Art. 8 ECLI:CE:ECHR:2014:1003JUD001273810
* *The central issue in this case is whether, bearing in mind the margin of appreciation afforded to States in immigration matters, a fair balance has been struck between the competing interests at stake, namely the personal interests of the applicant, her husband and their children in maintaining their family life in the Netherlands on the one hand and, on the other, the public order interests of the respondent Government in controlling immigration. In view of the particular circumstances of the case, it is questionable whether general immigration policy considerations of themselves can be regarded as sufficient justification for refusing the applicant residence in the Netherlands.*

☞ ECtHR 32504/11 ***Kaplan a.o. v. NO*** 24 July 2014
* violation of ECHR: Art. 8 ECLI:CE:ECHR:2014:0724JUD003250411
* *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.*

☞ ECtHR 38030/12 ***Khan v. GER*** 23 Sep. 2016
* interpr. of ECHR: Art. 8 ECLI:CE:ECHR:2016:0923JUD003803012
* *This case is about the applicant's (Khan) imminent expulsion to Pakistan after she had committed manslaughter in Germany in a state of mental incapacity. On 23 April 2015 the Court ruled that the expulsion would not give rise to a violation of Art. 8. Subsequently the case was referred to the Grand Chamber. The Grand Chamber was informed by the German Government that the applicant would not be expelled and granted a 'Duldung'. These assurances*

made the Grand Chamber to strike the application out of the list.

☞ ECtHR 41697/12 ***Krasniqi v. AUS*** 25 Apr. 2017
* no violation of ECHR: Art. 8 ECLI:CE:ECHR:2017:0425JUD004169712
* *The applicant is from Kosovo and entered Austria in 1994 when he was 19 years old. Within a year he was arrested for working illegally and was issued a five-year residence ban. He lodged an asylum application, which was dismissed, and returned voluntarily to Kosovo in 1997. In 1998 he went back to Austria and filed a second asylum request with his wife and daughter. Although the asylum claim was dismissed they were granted subsidiary protection. The temporary residence permit was extended a few times but expired in December 2009 as he had not applied for its renewal. After nine convictions on drugs offences and aggravated threat, he was issued a ten-year residence ban. Although the applicant is well integrated in Austria, the Court concludes that the Austrian authorities have not overstepped the margin of appreciation accorded to them in immigration matters by expelling the applicant.*

☞ ECtHR 7841/14 ***Levakovic v. DK*** 23 Oct. 2018
* no violation of ECHR: Art. 8 ECLI:CE:ECHR:2018:1023JUD000784114
* *This case concerns a decision to expel the applicant to Croatia, with which he had no ties apart from nationality, after he was tried and convicted for crimes committed in Denmark, where he had lived most of his life. The Court found that the domestic courts had made a thorough assessment of his personal circumstances, balancing the competing interests and taking Strasbourg case-law into account. The domestic courts had been aware that very strong reasons were necessary to justify the expulsion of a migrant who has been settled for a long time, but had found that his crimes were serious enough to warrant such a measure.*

☞ ECtHR 1638/03 ***Maslov v. AU*** 22 Mar. 2007
* violation of ECHR: Art. 8 ECLI:CE:ECHR:2007:0322JUD000163803
* *In addition to the criteria set out in Boultif (54273/00) and Üner (46410/99) the ECtHR considers that for a settled migrant who has lawfully spent all or the major part of his or her childhood and youth in the host country very serious reasons are required to justify expulsion. This is all the more so where the person concerned committed the offences underlying the expulsion measure as a juvenile.*

☞ ECtHR 13178/03 ***Mayeka v. BEL*** 12 Oct. 2006
* no violation of ECHR: Art. 5+8+13 ECLI:CE:ECHR:2006:1012JUD001317803
* *Mrs Mayeka, a Congolese national, arrived in Canada in September 2000, where she was granted refugee status in July 2001 and obtained indefinite leave to remain in March 2003. After being granted asylum, she asked her brother, a Dutch national living in the Netherlands, to collect her daughter Tabitha, who was then five years old, from the Democratic Republic of the Congo at the airport of Brussels and to look after her until she was able to join her mother in Canada. Shortly after arriving at Brussels airport on 18 August 2002, Tabitha was detained because she did not have the necessary documents to enter Belgium. An application for asylum that had been lodged on behalf of Tabitha was declared inadmissible by the Belgian Aliens Office. A request to place Tabitha in the care of foster parents was not answered. Although the Brussels Court of First instance held on 16 October 2002 that Tabitha's detention was unjust and ordered her immediate release, the Belgian authorities deported the five year old child to Congo on a plane.*
The Court considered that owing to her very young age, the fact that she was an illegal alien in a foreign land, that she was unaccompanied by her family from whom she had become separated and that she had been left to her own devices, Tabitha was in an extremely vulnerable situation.
The Court ruled that the measures taken by the Belgian authorities were far from adequate and that Belgium had violated its positive obligations to take requisite measures and preventive action. Since there was no risk of Tabitha's seeking to evade the supervision of the Belgian authorities, her detention in a closed centre for adults served no purpose and other measures more conducive to the higher interest of the child guaranteed by Article 3 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, could have been taken. Since Tabitha was an unaccompanied alien minor, Belgium was under an obligation to facilitate the reunion of the family. However, Belgium had failed to comply with these obligations and had disproportionately interfered with the applicants' rights to respect for their family life.

☞ ECtHR 52701/09 ***Mugenzi v. FR*** 10 July 2014
* violation of ECHR: Art. 8 ECLI:CE:ECHR:2014:0710JUD005270109
* *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 41215/14 ***Ndidi v. UK*** 14 Sep. 2017
* no violation of ECHR: Art. 8 ECLI:CE:ECHR:2017:0914JUD004121514
* *This case concerns a Nigerian national's complaint about his deportation from the UK. Mr Ndidi, the applicant, arrived with his mother in the UK aged two. He had an escalating history of offending from the age of 12, with periods spent in institutions for young offenders. He was released in March 2011, aged 24, and served with a deportation order. All his appeals were unsuccessful. The Court pointed out in particular that there would have to be strong reasons for it to carry out a fresh assessment of this balancing exercise, especially where independent and impartial domestic courts had carefully examined the facts of the case, applying the relevant human rights standards consistently with the European Convention and its case-law.*

☞ ECtHR 41615/07 ***Neulinger v. CH*** 6 July 2010
* violation of ECHR: Art. 8 ECLI:CE:ECHR:2010:0706JUD004161507
* *The child's best interests, from a personal development perspective, will depend on a variety of individual circumstances, in particular his age and level of maturity, the presence or absence of his parents and his*

environment and experiences. For that reason, those best interests must be assessed in each individual case. To that end they enjoy a certain margin of appreciation, which remains subject, however, to a European supervision whereby the Court reviews under the Convention the decisions that those authorities have taken in the exercise of that power. In this case the Court notes that the child has Swiss nationality and that he arrived in the country in June 2005 at the age of two. He has been living there continuously ever since. He now goes to school in Switzerland and speaks French. Even though he is at an age where he still has a certain capacity for adaptation, the fact of being uprooted again from his habitual environment would probably have serious consequences for him, especially if he returns on his own, as indicated in the medical reports. His return to Israel cannot therefore be regarded as beneficial.

☞ ECtHR 55597/09 ***Nunez v. NO*** 28 June 2011
* violation of ECHR: Art. 8 ECLI:CE:ECHR:2011:0628JUD005559709
* *Athough 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 34848/07 ***O'Donoghue v. UK*** 14 Dec. 2010
* violation of ECHR: Art. 12+14 ECLI:CE:ECHR:2010:1214JUD003484807
* 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 38058/09 ***Osman v. DK*** 14 June 2011
* violation of ECHR: Art. 8 ECLI:CE:ECHR:2011:0614JUD003805809
* *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 76136/12 ***Ramadan v. MAL*** 21 June 2016
* no violation of ECHR: Art. 8 ECLI:CE:ECHR:2016:0621JUD007613612
* *Mr Ramadan, originally an Egyptian citizen, acquired Maltese citizenship after marrying a Maltese national. It was revoked by the Minister of Justice and Internal Affairs following a decision by a domestic court to annul the marriage on the ground that Mr Ramadan's only reason to marry had been to remain in Malta and acquire Maltese citizenship. Meanwhile, the applicant remarried a Russian national. The Court found that the decision depriving him of his citizenship, which had had a clear legal basis under the relevant national law and had been accompanied by hearings and remedies consistent with procedural fairness, had not been arbitrary.*

☞ ECtHR 76550/13 ***Saber a.o. v. SP*** 18 Dec. 2018
* violation of ECHR: Art. 8 ECLI:CE:ECHR:2018:1218JUD007655013
* *The Moroccan applicants had been tried and sentenced to imprisonment. The subsequent expulsion, which automatically resulted in the cancellation of any right of residence, was upheld by an administrative court, and in appeal by the High Court. However, the ECtHR found that the national authorities had failed to examine the nature and seriousness of the criminal convictions in question, as well as all the other criteria established by the case-law of the Court, in order to assess the necessity of the expulsion and exclusion orders.*

☞ ECtHR 77063/11 ***Salem v. DK*** 1 Dec. 2016
* no violation of ECHR: Art. 8 ECLI:CE:ECHR:2016:1201JUD007706311
* *The applicant is a stateless Palestinian from Lebanon. In 1994, having married a Danish woman he is granted a residence permit, and in 2000 he is also granted asylum. In June 2010 the applicant - by then father of 8 children - is convicted of drug trafficking and dealing, coercion by violence, blackmail, theft, and the possession of weapons. He is sentenced to five years imprisonment, which decision is upheld by the Supreme Court in 2011 adding a life-long ban on his return. Appeals against his expulsion are refused and at the end of 2014 he is deported to Libanon. The ECtHR rules that although the applicant has 8 children in Denmark, he has an extensive and serious criminal record. Also, he is not well-integrated into Danish society (still being illiterate and not being able to speak Danish).*

☞ ECtHR 12020/09 ***Udeh v. CH*** 16 Apr. 2013
* violation of ECHR: Art. 8 ECLI:CE:ECHR:2013:0416JUD001202009
* *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.

☞ ECtHR 46410/99 ***Üner v. NL*** 18 Oct. 2006
* violation of ECHR: Art. 8 ECLI:CE:ECHR:2006:1018JUD004641099
* *The expulsion of an alien raises a problem within the context of art. 8 ECHR if that alien has a family whom he has to leave behind. In Boultif (54273/00) the Court elaborated the relevant criteria which it would use in order to assess whether an expulsion measure was necessary in a democratic society and proportionate to the legitimate aim pursued. In this judgment the Court adds two additional criteria:*
– the best interests and well-being of the children, in particular the seriousness of the difficulties which any children of the applicant are likely to encounter in the country to which the applicant is to be expelled; and
– the solidity of social, cultural and family ties with the host country and with the country of destination.

☞ ECtHR 7994/14 ***Ustinova v. RUS*** 8 Nov. 2016
* violation of ECHR: Art. 8 ECLI:CE:ECHR:2016:1108JUD000799414
* *The applicant, Anna Ustinova, is a national of Ukraine who was born in 1984. She moved to live in Russia at the beginning of 2000. In March 2013 Ms Ustinova was denied re-entry to Russia after a visit to Ukraine with her two children. This denial was based on a decision issued by the Consumer Protection Authority (CPA) in June 2012, that, during her pregnancy in 2012, Ms Ustinova had tested positive for HIV and therefor her presence in Russia constituted a threat to public health.*
This decision was challenged but upheld by a district Court, a Regional Court and the Supreme Court. Only the Constitutional Court declared this incompatible with the Russian Constitution. Although ms Ustinova has since been able to re-enter Russia via a border crossing with no controls, her name has not yet been definitively deleted from the list of undesirable individuals maintained by the Border Control Service.

☞ ECtHR 42517/15 ***Yurdaer v. DK*** 20 Nov. 2018
* no violation of ECHR: Art. 8 ECLI:CE:ECHR:2018:1120JUD004251715
* *Mr Yurdaer, a Turkish national, was born in Germany (1973) and moved to Denmark when he was 5 years old. He married in Denmark (1995) and got three children. These children are also Turkish nationals. The applicant was convicted twice of drug offences and sentenced to 8 years imprisonment. By then, he had stayed for almost 28 years lawfully in Denmark. Subsequently, the Danish immigration service advised for expulsion and ultimately the High Court upheld this expulsion order, which was implemented in 2017 and combined with a permanent ban on re-entry. The ECtHR recognised that the Danish Courts carefully balanced the competing interests and explicitly took into account the criteria set out in the Court's case−law, including the applicant's family situation. Thus, the Court found that the interference was supported by relevant and sufficient reasons, and was proportionate.*

☞ ECtHR 47781/10 ***Zezev v. RUS*** 12 June 2018
* violation of ECHR: Art. 8 ECLI:CE:ECHR:2018:0612JUD004778110
* *In this case an application for Russian nationality of a Kazakh national married to a Russian national was rejected based on information from the Secret Sercice implicating that the applicant posed a treat to Russia's national security.*

1.3.5 CRC views on Regular Migration

☞ CRC C/79/DR/12/2017 ***C.E. v. BEL*** 27 Sep. 2018
* violation of CRC: Art. 10
* *C.E. is an in Morocco abandoned child, which was entrusted by the Marrakesh Court of First Instance under 'kafala' (care of abandoned children) to two Belgian-Moroccan married nationals. Kafala establishes a sort of guardianship but does not give the child any family rights. Thus, the Belgian authorities refused a visa on the basis of family reunification. Also a long-stay visa on humanitarian grounds was refused based on the argument that kafala does not count as adoption and that a visa on humanitarian grounds is no replacement of (an application for) adoption.*
The Committee recalls that it is not its role to replace national authorities in the interpretation of national law and the assessment of facts and evidence, but to verify the absence of arbitrariness or denial of justice in the assessment of authorities, and to ensure that the best interests of the child have been a primary consideration in this assessment. Subsequently, the Committee notes that the term 'family' should be interpreted broadly including also adoptive or foster parents. The Committee concludes that the State party has failed to fulfil its obligations: violation of art. 3, 10 and 12.

2 Borders and Visas

2.1 Borders and Visas: Adopted Measures

case law sorted in chronological order

Regulation 2016/1624 — **Border and Coast Guard Agency**

Creating a Borders and Coast Guard Agency

* OJ 2016 L 251/1
* Repealing: Regulation 2007/2004
and Regulation 1168/2011 (Frontex)
and Regulation 863/2007 (Rapid Interventions Teams).

Regulation 562/2006 — **Borders Code I**

Establishing a Community Code on the rules governing the movement of persons across borders

* OJ 2006 L 105/1
* This Regulation is replaced by Regulation 2016/399 Borders Code II.
amd by Reg. 296/2008 (OJ 2008 L 97/60)
amd by Reg. 81/2009 (OJ 2009 L 35/56): On the use of the VIS
amd by Reg. 810/2009 (OJ 2009 L 243/1): Visa Code
amd by Reg. 265/2010 (OJ 2010 L 85/1): On movement of persons with a long-stay visa
amd by Reg. 610/2013 (OJ 2013 L 182/1): On Fundamental Rights
amd by Reg. 1051/2013 (OJ 2013 L 295/1): On specific measures in case of serious deficiencies

CJEU judgments

☞	CJEU C-412/17 ***Touring Tours a.o. v. GER***	13 Dec.	2018	Art. 22+23
☞	CJEU C-9/16 ***A. v. GER***	21 June	2017	Art. 20+21
☞	CJEU C-17/16 ***El Dakkak v. FRA***	4 May	2017	Art. 4(1)
☞	CJEU C-575/12 ***Air Baltic v. LAT***	4 Sep.	2014	Art. 5
☞	CJEU C-23/12 ***Zakaria v. LAT***	17 Jan.	2013	Art. 13(3)
☞	CJEU C-355/10 ***EP v. Council***	5 Sep.	2012	
☞	CJEU C-278/12 (PPU) ***Adil v. NL***	19 July	2012	Art. 20+21
☞	CJEU C-606/10 ***ANAFE v. FRA***	14 June	2012	Art. 13+5(4)(a)
☞	CJEU C-430/10 ***Gaydarov v. BUL***	17 Nov.	2011	
☞	CJEU C-188/10 ***Melki & Abdeli v. FRA***	22 June	2010	Art. 20+21
☞	CJEU C-261/08 ***Garcia & Cabrera v. ESP***	22 Oct.	2009	Art. 5+11+13

See further: § 2.3

Regulation 2016/399 — **Borders Code II**

On the rules governing the movement of persons across borders. Codification of all previous amendments of the (Schengen) Borders Code

* OJ 2016 L 77/1
* This Regulation replaces Regulation 562/2006 Borders Code I
amd by Reg. 458/2017 (OJ 2017 L 74): on the reinforcement of checks against relevant dBases and ext. borders
amd by Reg. 2225/2017 (OJ 2017 L 327/1): on the use of the EES

CJEU judgments

☞	CJEU C-444/17 ***Arib v. FRA***	19 Mar.	2019	Art. 32

CJEU pending cases

☞	CJEU C-584/18 ***D.Z. v. Blue Air***	pending	Art. 14(2)
☞	CJEU C-380/18 ***E.P. v. NL***	pending	Art. 6(1)(e)
☞	CJEU C-341/18 ***J. a.o. v. NL***	pending	Art. 11

See further: § 2.3

Decision 574/2007 — **Borders Fund I**

Establishing European External Borders Fund

* OJ 2007 L 144
* This Regulation is repealed by Regulation 515/2004 (Borders Fund II)

Regulation 515/2014 — **Borders Fund II**

Internal Security Fund

* OJ 2014 L 150/143
* This Regulation repeals Decision No 574/2007 (Borders Fund I)

Regulation 2017/2226 — **EES**

Establishing an Entry/Exit System (EES) to register entry and exit data and refusal of entry data of third country nationals crossing the external borders
* OJ 2017 L 327/20 impl. date 29 Dec. 2017

Regulation 2018/1240 **ETIAS**
Establishing a European Travel Information and Authorisation System
* OJ 2018 L 236/1
* Amending Regulations 1077/2011, 515/2014, 2016/399, 2016/1624 and 2017/2226.
New *amd by Reg. 817/2019 (OJ 2019 L 135/27): Amendment*

Regulation 2018/1726 **EU-LISA**
On the European Agency for the Operational Management of large-scale IT systems
* OJ 2018 L 295/99
* Replacing Reg. 1077/2011 (VIS Management Agency)
New *amd by Reg. 817/2019 (OJ 2019 L 135/27)*

Regulation 1052/2013 **EUROSUR**
Establishing the European Border Surveillance System (Eurosur)
* OJ 2013 L 295/11 impl. date 26 Nov. 2013

CJEU judgments
☞ CJEU C-44/14 ***Spain v. EP & Council*** 8 Sep. 2015
See further: § 2.3

Regulation 2007/2004 **Frontex**
Establishing External Borders Agency
* OJ 2004 L 349/1
* This Regulation is replaced by Regulation 2016/1624 Border and Coast Guard Agency
amd by Reg. 863/2007 (OJ 2007 L 199/30): Border guard teams
amd by Reg. 1168/2011 (OJ 2011 L 304/1): Code of Conduct and joint operations

Regulation 1931/2006 **Local Border traffic**
Local border traffic within enlarged EU at external borders of EU
* OJ 2006 L 405/1 impl. date 19 Jan. 2007
amd by Cor. 1931/2006 (OJ 2006 L 029): Corrigendum
amd by Reg. 1342/2011 (OJ 2011 L 347/41): On definition of border area

CJEU judgments
☞ CJEU C-254/11 ***Shomodi v. HUN*** 21 Mar. 2013 Art. 2(a)+3(3)
See further: § 2.3

Regulation 656/2014 **Maritime Surveillance**
Rules for the surveillance of the external sea borders in the context of operational cooperation coordinated by Frontex
* OJ 2014 L 189/93 impl. date 17 July 2014

Directive 2004/82 **Passenger Data**
On the obligation of carriers to communicate passenger data
* OJ 2004 L 261/24 impl. date 5 Sep. 2006 UK opt in

Regulation 2252/2004 **Passports**
On standards for security features and biometrics in passports and travel documents
* OJ 2004 L 385/1 impl. date 18 Jan. 2005
amd by Reg. 444/2009 (OJ 2009 L 142/1): on biometric identifiers

CJEU judgments
☞ CJEU C-446/12 ***Willems a.o. v. NL*** 16 Apr. 2015 Art. 4(3)
☞ CJEU C-101/13 ***U. v. GER*** 2 Oct. 2014
☞ CJEU C-139/13 ***Com. v. Belgium*** 13 Feb. 2014 Art. 6
☞ CJEU C-291/12 ***Schwarz v. GER*** 17 Oct. 2013 Art. 1(2)
See further: § 2.3

Recommendation 761/2005 **Researchers**
On uniform short-stay visas for researchers from third countries
* OJ 2005 L 289/23

Convention **Schengen Acquis**
Implementing the Schengen Agreement of 14 June 1985
* OJ 2000 L 239

CJEU judgments
☞ CJEU C-240/17 ***E. v. FIN*** 16 Jan. 2018 Art. 25(1)+25(2)
See further: § 2.3

Regulation 1053/2013 **Schengen Evaluation**
Schengen Evaluation

* OJ 2013 L 295/27

Regulation 1987/2006 — **SIS II**

Establishing 2nd generation Schengen Information System

* OJ 2006 L 381/4 impl. date 17 Jan. 2007

* 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
amd by Reg 1988/2006 (OJ 2006 L 411/1): on extending funding of SIS II
amd by Reg. 1726/2018 (OJ 2018 L 295/99): establishing agency (EU-LISA)

Council Decision 2016/268 — **SIS II Access**

List of competent authorities which are authorised to search directly the data contained in the 2nd generation SIS

* OJ 2016 C 268/1

Council Decision 2016/1209 — **SIS II Manual**

On the SIRENE Manual and other implementing measures for SIS II

* OJ 2016 L 203/35

Regulation 2018/1861 — **SIS II usage on borders**

On the use of SIS for the return of illegally staying third-country nationals

* OJ 2018 L 312/14

* amending the Schengen Convention and repealing Reg. 1987/2006

New *amd by Reg. 817/2019 (OJ 2019 L 135/27)*

Regulation 2018/1860 — **SIS II usage on returns**

On the use of SIS for the return of illegally staying third-country nationals

* OJ 2018 L 312/1

Council Decision 2017/818 — **Temporary Internal Border Control**

Setting out a Recommendation for prolonging temporary internal border control in exceptional circumstances putting the overall functioning of the Schengen area at risk

* OJ 2017 L 122/73

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 896/2006 — **Transit Switzerland**

Transit through Switzerland and Liechtenstein

* OJ 2006 L 167/8
amd by Dec 586/2008 (OJ 2008 L 162/27)

CJEU judgments

☞ CJEU C-139/08 ***Kqiku v. GER*** 2 Apr. 2009 Art. 1+2

See further: § 2.3

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 impl. date 25 Nov. 2011

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)

New *amd by Reg. 817/2019 (OJ 2019 L 135/27): Amendment*

Decision 512/2004 — **VIS (start)**

Establishing Visa Information System (VIS)

* OJ 2004 L 213/5

Council Decision 2008/633 — **VIS Access**

Access for consultation of the Visa Information System (VIS) by designated authorities of Member States and Europol

* OJ 2008 L 218/129

Regulation 1077/2011 — **VIS Management Agency**

Establishing an Agency to manage VIS, SIS & Eurodac

* OJ 2011 L 286/1

* Repealed and replaced by Reg. 2018/1726 (EU-LISA)

Regulation 810/2009 — **Visa Code**

Establishing a Community Code on Visas

* OJ 2009 L 243/1 — impl. date 5 Apr. 2010

amd by Reg. 154/2012 (OJ 2012 L 58/3): On the relation with the Schengen acquis

New *amd by Reg. 1155/2019 (OJ 2019 L 188/55)*

CJEU judgments

New ☞	CJEU C-680/17 ***Vethanayagam v. NL***	29 July	2019	Art. 8(4)+32(3)
☞	CJEU C-403/16 ***El Hassani v. POL***	13 Dec.	2017	Art. 32
☞	CJEU C-638/16 PPU ***X. & X. v. BEL***	7 Mar.	2017	Art. 25(1)(a)
☞	CJEU C-575/12 ***Air Baltic v. LAT***	4 Sep.	2014	Art. 24(1)+34
☞	CJEU C-84/12 ***Koushkaki v. GER***	19 Dec.	2013	Art. 23(4)+32(1)
☞	CJEU C-83/12 ***Vo v. GER***	10 Apr.	2012	Art. 21+34

CJEU pending cases

New ☞	CJEU C-225/19 ***R.N.N.S. v. NL***	pending		Art. 32(3)

See further: § 2.3

Regulation 1683/95 — **Visa Format**

Uniform format for visas

* OJ 1995 L 164/1 — UK opt in

* Repealed bij Reg. 810/2009 (Visa Code)

amd by Reg. 334/2002 (OJ 2002 L 53/7)

amd by Reg. 856/2008 (OJ 2008 L 235/1)

Regulation 539/2001 — **Visa List I**

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

* OJ 2001 L 81/1

* This Regulation is replaced by Regulation 2018/1806 Visa List II

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 Macedonia, Montenegro and Serbia
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
amd by Reg. 509/2014 (OJ 2014 L 149/67): Lifting visa req. for Colombia, Dominica, Grenada,
amd by Reg. 509/2014 (OJ 2014 L 149/67): and Kiribati, Marshall Islands, Micronesia, Nauru,
amd by Reg. 509/2014 (OJ 2014 L 149/67): and Palau, Peru, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent & Gr's,
amd by Reg. 509/2014 (OJ 2014 L 149/67): and Samoa, Solomon Islands, Timor-Leste, Tonga,
amd by Reg. 509/2014 (OJ 2014 L 149/67): and Trinidad and Tobago, Tuvalu, the UA Emirate,
amd by Reg. 509/2014 (OJ 2014 L 149/67): and Vanuatu.
amd by Reg. 372/2017 (OJ 2017 L 61/7): Lifting visa req. for Georgia
amd by Reg. 371/2017 (OJ 2017 L61/1): On Suspension mechanism
amd by Reg. 850/2017 (OJ 2017 L 133/1): Lifting visa req. for Ukraine

Regulation 2018/1806 — **Visa List II**

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

* OJ 2018 L 303/39

* This Regulation replaces Regulation 539/2001 Visa List I

amd by Reg 592/2019 (OJ 2019 L 103I/1): Waive visas for UK in the context of Brexit

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 November 1950) — impl. date 31 Aug. 1954

ECtHR Judgments

☞	ECtHR 43639/12 ***Khanh v. Cyprus***	4 Dec.	2018	Art. 3
☞	ECtHR 19356/07 ***Shioshvili a.o. v. RUS***	20 Dec.	2016	Art. 3+13
☞	ECtHR 53608/11 ***B.M. v. GR***	19 Dec.	2013	Art. 3+13
☞	ECtHR 55352/12 ***Aden Ahmed v. MAL***	23 July	2013	Art. 3+5
☞	ECtHR 11463/09 ***Samaras v. GR***	28 Feb.	2012	Art. 3
☞	ECtHR 27765/09 ***Hirsi v. IT***	21 Feb.	2012	Art. 3+13

See further: § 2.3

2.2 Borders and Visas: Proposed Measures

Regulation amending Regulation

On temporary reintroduction of checks at internal borders

* COM (2017) 571, 27 Sep 2017

* amending Borders Code (Reg. 2016/399)

New Council and EP could not agree before EP elections

Regulation amending Regulation 539/2001 — **Visa waiver Kosovo**

Visa List amendment

* COM (2016) 277, 4 May 2016

* Discussions within Council

Regulation amending Regulation 539/2001 — **Visa waiver Turkey**

Visa List amendment

* COM (2016) 279, 4 May 2016

Regulation

New funding programme for borders and visas

* COM (2018) 473, 12 June 2018

* EP adopted position

New Council and EP could not agree before EP elections

Regulation

ETIAS access to law enforcement databases

* COM (2019) 3, 7 Jan 2019

New Council position agreed. no EP position yet

Regulation

ETIAS access to to immigration databases

* COM (2019) 4, 7 Jan 2019

New Council position agreed. no EP position yet

Regulation

Amending Reg. on Visa Information System

* COM (2018) 302, 16 May 2018

New Council and EP could not agree before EP elections

Regulation — **New Frontex regulation**

Frontex II

* COM (2018) 631, 12 Sep 2018

* EP and Council agreed text

New not yet adopted

2.3 Borders and Visas: Jurisprudence

case law sorted in alphabetical order

2.3.1 CJEU Judgments on Borders and Visas

☞ CJEU C-9/16 — ***A. v. Germany*** — 21 June 2017

* interpr. of Reg. 562/2006 — Borders Code I Art. 20+21 — ECLI:EU:C:2017:483

ref. from Amtsgericht Kehl, Germany, 7 Jan. 2016

* *Art. 20 and 21 must be interpreted as precluding national legislation, which confers on the police authorities of a MS the power to check the identity of any person, within an area of 30 kilometres from that MS's land border with other Schengen States, with a view to preventing or terminating unlawful entry into or residence in the territory of that Member State or preventing certain criminal offences which undermine the security of the border, irrespective of the behaviour of the person concerned and of the existence of specific circumstances, unless that legislation lays*

down the necessary framework for that power ensuring that the practical exercise of it cannot have an effect equivalent to that of border checks, which is for the referring court to verify.
Also, Art. 20 and 21 must be interpreted as not precluding national legislation, which permits the police authorities of the MS to carry out, on board trains and on the premises of the railways of that MS, identity or border crossing document checks on any person, and briefly to stop and question any person for that purpose, if those checks are based on knowledge of the situation or border police experience, provided that the exercise of those checks is subject under national law to detailed rules and limitations determining the intensity, frequency and selectivity of the checks, which is for the referring court to verify.

☞ CJEU C-278/12 (PPU) — ***Adil v. NL*** — 19 July 2012
* interpr. of Reg. 562/2006 — Borders Code I Art. 20+21 — ECLI:EU:C:2012:508
ref. from Raad van State, NL, 4 June 2012
* *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.*

☞ CJEU C-575/12 — ***Air Baltic v. Latvia*** — 4 Sep. 2014
* interpr. of Reg. 562/2006 — Borders Code I Art. 5 — ECLI:EU:C:2014:2155
ref. from Administratīvā apgabaltiesa, Latvia, 7 Dec. 2012
* *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.*

☞ CJEU C-575/12 — ***Air Baltic v. Latvia*** — 4 Sep. 2014
* interpr. of Reg. 810/2009 — Visa Code Art. 24(1)+34 — ECLI:EU:C:2014:2155
ref. from Administratīvā apgabaltiesa, Latvia, 7 Dec. 2012
* *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 v. France*** — 14 June 2012
* interpr. of Reg. 562/2006 — Borders Code I Art. 13+5(4)(a) — ECLI:EU:C:2012:348
ref. from Conseil d'Etat, France, 22 Dec. 2010
* 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-444/17 — ***Arib v. France*** — 19 Mar. 2019
* interpr. of Reg. 2016/399 — Borders Code II Art. 32 — ECLI:EU:C:2019:220
ref. from Cour de Cassation, France, 21 July 2017
* *Art. 2(2)(a) of Directive 2008/115 read in conjunction with Art. 32 of Regulation 2016/399 must be interpreted as not applying to the situation of an illegally staying third-country national who was apprehended in the immediate vicinity of an internal border of a Member State, even where that Member State has reintroduced border control at that border, pursuant to Article 25 of the regulation, on account of a serious threat to public policy or internal security in that Member State.*

☞ CJEU C-241/05 — ***Bot v. France*** — 4 Oct. 2006
* interpr. of — Schengen Agreement: Art. 20(1) — ECLI:EU:C:2006:634
ref. from Conseil d'Etat, France, 9 May 2005
* *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-257/01 — ***Com. v. Council*** — 18 Jan. 2005
* validity of — Visa Applications: — ECLI:EU:C:2005:25
ref. from Commission, EC, 3 July 2001
* challenge to Regs. 789/2001 and 790/2001
* *The Council implementing powers with regard to certain detailed provisions and practical procedures for examining visa applications and border checks and surveillance is upheld.*

☞ CJEU C-139/13 — ***Com. v. Belgium*** — 13 Feb. 2014
* violation of Reg. 2252/2004 — Passports Art. 6 — ECLI:EU:C:2014:80
ref. from European Commission, EU, 19 Mar. 2013
* *Failure to implement biometric passports containing digital fingerprints within the prescribed periods.*

☞ CJEU C-88/14 — ***Com. v. EP*** — 16 July 2015

* validity of Reg. 539/2001 Visa List ECLI:EU:C:2015:499
ref. from European Commission, EU, 21 Feb. 2014
* *The Commission had requested an annullment of an amendment of the visa list by Regulation 1289/2013. The Court dismisses the action.*

☞ CJEU C-240/17 ***E. v. Finland*** 16 Jan. 2018
* interpr. of Schengen Acquis: Art. 25(1)+25(2) ECLI:EU:C:2018:8
ref. from Korkein hallinto-oikeus, Finland, 10 May 2017
* *Art 25(1) must be interpreted as meaning that it is open to the Contracting State which intends to issue a return decision accompanied by a ban on entry and stay in the Schengen Area to a TCN who holds a valid residence permit issued by another Contracting State to initiate the consultation procedure laid down in that provision even before the issue of the return decision. That procedure must, in any event, be initiated as soon as such a decision has been issued.*
Art 25(2) must be interpreted as meaning that it does not preclude the return decision accompanied by an entry ban issued by a Contracting State to a TCN who is the holder of a valid residence permit issued by another Contracting State being enforced even though the consultation procedure laid down in that provision is ongoing, if that TCN is regarded by the Contracting State issuing the alert as representing a threat to public order or national security.

☞ CJEU C-17/16 ***El Dakkak v. France*** 4 May 2017
* interpr. of Reg. 562/2006 Borders Code I Art. 4(1) ECLI:EU:C:2017:341
ref. from Cour de Cassation, France, 12 Jan. 2016
* *The concept of crossing an external border of the Union is defined differently in the 'Cash Regulation' (1889/2005) compared to the Borders Code.*

☞ CJEU C-403/16 ***El Hassani v. Poland*** 13 Dec. 2017
* interpr. of Reg. 810/2009 Visa Code Art. 32 ECLI:EU:C:2017:960
ref. from Naczelny Sąd Administracyjny, Poland, 19 July 2016
* *Article 32(3) must be interpreted as meaning that it requires Member States to provide for an appeal procedure against decisions refusing visas, the procedural rules for which are a matter for the legal order of each Member State in accordance with the principles of equivalence and effectiveness. Those proceedings must, at a certain stage of the proceedings, guarantee a judicial appeal.*

☞ CJEU C-355/10 ***EP v. Council*** 5 Sep. 2012
* violation of Reg. 562/2006 Borders Code I ECLI:EU:C:2012:516
ref. from European Parliament, EU, 14 July 2010
* 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 ***Garcia & Cabrera v. Spain*** 22 Oct. 2009
* interpr. of Reg. 562/2006 Borders Code I Art. 5+11+13 ECLI:EU:C:2009:648
ref. from Tribunal Superior de Justicia de Murcia, Spain, 19 June 2008
* 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
* joined case with C-348/08
* *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 v. Bulgaria*** 17 Nov. 2011
* interpr. of Reg. 562/2006 Borders Code I ECLI:EU:C:2011:749
ref. from Administrativen sad Sofia-grad, Bulgaria, 2 Sep. 2010
* *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-84/12 ***Koushkaki v. Germany*** 19 Dec. 2013
* interpr. of Reg. 810/2009 Visa Code Art. 23(4)+32(1) ECLI:EU:C:2013:862
ref. from Verwaltungsgericht Berlin, Germany, 17 Feb. 2012
* *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 — ***Kqiku v. Germany*** — 2 Apr. 2009
* interpr. of Dec. 896/2006 — Transit Switzerland Art. 1+2 — ECLI:EU:C:2009:230
ref. from Oberlandesgericht Karlsruhe, Germany, 7 Apr. 2008
* 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 — ***Melki & Abdeli v. France*** — 22 June 2010
* interpr. of Reg. 562/2006 — Borders Code I Art. 20+21 — ECLI:EU:C:2010:363
ref. from Cour de Cassation , France, 16 Apr. 2010
* joined case with C-189/10
* *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 v. Germany*** — 17 Oct. 2013
* interpr. of Reg. 2252/2004 — Passports Art. 1(2) — ECLI:EU:C:2013:670
ref. from Verwaltungsgericht Gelsenkirchen, Germany, 12 June 2012
* *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 v. Hungary*** — 21 Mar. 2013
* interpr. of Reg. 1931/2006 — Local Border traffic Art. 2(a)+3(3) — ECLI:EU:C:2012:773
ref. from Supreme Court, Hungary, 25 May 2011
* *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-44/14 — ***Spain v. EP & Council*** — 8 Sep. 2015
* non-transp. of Reg. 1052/2013 — EUROSUR — ECLI:EU:C:2015:554
ref. from Government, Spain, 27 Jan. 2014
* *Limited forms of cooperation do not constitute a form of taking part within the meaning of Article 4 of the Schengen Protocol. Consequently, Article 19 of the Eurosur Regulation cannot be regarded as giving the Member States the option of concluding agreements which allow Ireland or the United Kingdom to take part in the provisions in force of the Schengen acquis in the area of the crossing of the external borders.*

☞ CJEU C-412/17 — ***Touring Tours a.o. v. Germany*** — 13 Dec. 2018
* interpr. of Reg. 562/2006 — Borders Code I Art. 22+23 — ECLI:EU:C:2018:1005
ref. from Bundesverwaltungsgericht, Germany, 10 July 2017
* Joined Cases C−412/17 and C−474/17
* *Article 67(2) TFEU and Article 21 Borders Code must be interpreted to the effect that they preclude legislation of a MS, which requires every coach transport undertaking providing a regular cross-border service within the Schengen area to the territory of that MS to check the passports and residence permits of passengers before they cross an internal border in order to prevent the transport of TCNs not in possession of those travel documents to the national territory, and which allows, for the purposes of complying with that obligation to carry out checks, the police authorities to issue orders prohibiting such transport, accompanied by a threat of a recurring fine, against transport undertakings which have been found to have conveyed to that territory TCNs who were not in possession of the requisite travel documents.*

☞ CJEU C-101/13 — ***U. v. Germany*** — 2 Oct. 2014
* interpr. of Reg. 2252/2004 — Passports — ECLI:EU:C:2014:2249
ref. from Verwaltungsgerichtshof Baden-Württemberg, Germany, 28 Feb. 2013
* *About the recording and spelling of names, surnames and family names in passports. Where a MS whose law provides that a person's name comprises his forenames and surname chooses nevertheless to include (also) the birth name of the passport holder in the machine readable personal data page of the passport, that State is required to state clearly in the caption of those fields that the birth name is entered there.*

New ☞ CJEU C-680/17 — ***Vethanayagam v. NL*** — 29 July 2019
* interpr. of Reg. 810/2009 — Visa Code Art. 8(4)+32(3) — ECLI:EU:C:2019:627
ref. from Rechtbank Den Haag (zp) Utrecht, NL, 5 Dec. 2017
* *Art. 32(3) of the Visa Code, must be interpreted as not allowing the sponsor to bring an appeal in his own name against a decision refusing a visa.*
Art. 8(4)(d) and Art. 32(3), must be interpreted as meaning that, when there is a bilateral representation arrangement providing that the consular authorities of the representing MS are entitled to take decisions refusing visas, it is for the competent authorities of that MS to decide on appeals brought against a decision refusing a visa.
A combined interpretation of Art. 8(4)(d) and Art. 32(3) according to which an appeal against a decision refusing a visa must be conducted against the representing State, is compatible with the fundamental right to effective judicial protection.

☞ CJEU C-83/12 — ***Vo v. Germany*** — 10 Apr. 2012
* interpr. of Reg. 810/2009 — Visa Code Art. 21+34 — ECLI:EU:C:2012:202
ref. from Bundesgerichtshof, Germany, 17 Feb. 2012
* *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-446/12 — ***Willems a.o. v. NL*** — 16 Apr. 2015
* interpr. of Reg. 2252/2004 — Passports Art. 4(3) — ECLI:EU:C:2015:238
ref. from Raad van State, NL, 3 Oct. 2012
* *Article 4(3) does not require the Member States to guarantee, in their legislation, that biometric data collected and stored in accordance with that regulation will not be collected, processed and used for purposes other than the issue of the passport or travel document, since that is not a matter which falls within the scope of that regulation.*

☞ CJEU C-638/16 PPU — ***X. & X. v. Belgium*** — 7 Mar. 2017
* interpr. of Reg. 810/2009 — Visa Code Art. 25(1)(a) — ECLI:EU:C:2017:173
ref. from Conseil du contentieux des étrangers, Belgium, 12 Dec. 2016
* *Contrary to the opinion of the AG, the Court ruled that Article 1 of the Visa Code, must be interpreted as meaning that an application for a visa with limited territorial validity made on humanitarian grounds by a TCN, on the basis of Article 25 of the code, to the representation of the MS of destination that is within the territory of a third country, with a view to lodging, immediately upon his or her arrival in that MS, an application for international protection and, thereafter, to staying in that MS for more than 90 days in a 180-day period, does not fall within the scope of that code but, as EU law currently stands, solely within that of national law.*

☞ CJEU C-23/12 — ***Zakaria v. Latvia*** — 17 Jan. 2013
* interpr. of Reg. 562/2006 — Borders Code I Art. 13(3) — ECLI:EU:C:2013:24
ref. from Augstākās tiesas Senāts, Latvia, 17 Jan. 2012
* *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-584/18 — ***D.Z. v. Blue Air***
* interpr. of Reg. 2016/399 — Borders Code II Art. 14(2)
ref. from Eparchiako Dikastirio Larnakas, Cyprus, 19 Sep. 2018
* *On the exemption of visa obligations.*

☞ CJEU C-380/18 — ***E.P. v. NL***
* interpr. of Reg. 2016/399 — Borders Code II Art. 6(1)(e) — ECLI:EU:C:2019:609
ref. from Raad van State, NL, 11 June 2018
* AG: 11 Jul 2019
* *On the issue of the criteria to determine a threat to public order.*

☞ CJEU C-341/18 — ***J. a.o. v. NL***
* interpr. of Reg. 2016/399 — Borders Code II Art. 11
ref. from Raad van State, NL, 24 May 2018
* *On the necessity of providing departure stamps at (external) border crossings particularly in harbours.*

New ☞ CJEU C-225/19 — ***R.N.N.S. v. NL***
* interpr. of Reg. 810/2009 — Visa Code Art. 32(3)
ref. from Rechtbank Den Haag (zp) Haarlem, NL, 14 Mar. 2019
* *In the case of an appeal as referred to in Art. 32(3) of the Visa Code against a final decision refusing a visa on the ground referred to in Art. 32(1)(a)(vi) of the Visa Code, can it be said that there is an effective remedy within the meaning of Art. 47 of the EU Charter under the following circumstances:*
– where, in its reasons for the decision, the MS merely stated: 'you are regarded by one or more MS as a threat to public policy, internal security, public health as defined in Art. 2.19 or 2.21 of the Schengen Borders Code, or to the international relations of one or more MS';
– where, in the decision or in the appeal, the MS does not state which specific ground or grounds of those four grounds set out in Art. 32(1)(a)(vi) of the Visa Code is being invoked;
– where, in the appeal, the MS does not provide any further substantive information or substantiation of the ground or grounds on which the objection of the other MS (or MSs) is based?

2.3.3 ECtHR Judgments on Borders and Visas

☞ ECtHR 55352/12 — ***Aden Ahmed v. MAL*** — 23 July 2013
* violation of — ECHR: Art. 3+5 — ECLI:CE:ECHR:2013:0723JUD005535212
* *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 53608/11 ***B.M. v. GR*** 19 Dec. 2013
* violation of ECHR: Art. 3+13 ECLI:CE:ECHR:2013:1219JUD005360811
* *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 27765/09 ***Hirsi v. IT*** 21 Feb. 2012
* violation of ECHR: Art. 3+13 ECLI:CE:ECHR:2012:0221JUD002776509
* *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 43639/12 ***Khanh v. Cyprus*** 4 Dec. 2018
* violation of ECHR: Art. 3 ECLI:CE:ECHR:2018:1204JUD004363912
* *The applicant Vietnamese woman had been held in pre-removal detention at a police station for a period of approximately five months. The Court restated that police stations and similar establishments are designed to accommodate people for very short duration, and the CPT as well as the national Ombudsman had deemed the police station in question unsuitable for accommodating people for longer periods. As the Government had failed to submit information capable of refuting the applicant's allegations about overcrowding, the Court concluded that the conditions of detention had amounted to degrading treatment prohibited by art. 3*

☞ ECtHR 11463/09 ***Samaras v. GR*** 28 Feb. 2012
* violation of ECHR: Art. 3 ECLI:CE:ECHR:2012:0228JUD001146309
* *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.*

☞ ECtHR 19356/07 ***Shioshvili a.o. v. RUS*** 20 Dec. 2016
* violation of ECHR: Art. 3+13 ECLI:CE:ECHR:2016:1220JUD001935607
* *Applicant with Georgian nationality, is expelled from Russia with her four children after living there for 8 years and being eight months pregnant. While leaving Russia they are taken off a train and forced to walk to the border. A few weeks later she gives birth to a dead child. Violation (also) of article 2 and 4 Protocol nr. 4.*

3 Irregular Migration

3.1 Irregular Migration: Adopted Measures

case law sorted in chronological order

Directive 2001/51 — **Carrier sanctions**

Obligation of carriers to return TCNs when entry is refused

* OJ 2001 L 187/45 — impl. date 11 Feb. 2003 — UK opt in

Decision 267/2005 — **Early Warning System**

Establishing a secure web-based Information and Coordination Network for MS' Migration Management Services

* OJ 2005 L 83/48 — UK opt in

Directive 2009/52 — **Employers Sanctions**

Minimum standards on sanctions and measures against employers of illegally staying TCNs

* OJ 2009 L 168/24 — impl. date 20 July 2011

Directive 2003/110 — **Expulsion by Air**

Assistance with transit for expulsion by air

* OJ 2003 L 321/26

Decision 191/2004 — **Expulsion Costs**

On the compensation of the financial imbalances resulting from the mutual recognition of decisions on the expulsion of TCNs

* OJ 2004 L 60/55 — UK opt in

Directive 2001/40 — **Expulsion Decisions**

Mutual recognition of expulsion decisions of TCNs

* OJ 2001 L 149/34 — impl. date 2 Oct. 2002 — UK opt in

CJEU judgments

☞ CJEU C-456/14 ***Orrego Arias v. ESP*** — 3 Sep. 2015 — Art. 3(1)(a) - inadmissable

See further: § 3.3

Decision 573/2004 — **Expulsion Joint Flights**

On the organisation of joint flights for removals from the territory of two or more MSs, of TCNs

* OJ 2004 L 261/28 — UK opt in

Conclusion — **Expulsion via Land**

Transit via land for expulsion

* adopted 22 Dec. 2003 by Council — UK opt in

New **Regulation 2019/1240** — **Immigration Liaison Network**

On the creation of a European network of immigration liaison officers

* OJ 2019 L 198/88 — UK opt in

* Replaces by Reg 377/2004 (Liaison Officers)

Recommendation 2017/432 — **Return Dir. Implementation**

Making returns more effective when implementing the Returns Directive

* OJ 2017 L 66/15

Directive 2008/115 — **Return Directive**

On common standards and procedures in MSs for returning illegally staying TCNs

* OJ 2008 L 348/98 — impl. date 24 Dec. 2010

CJEU judgments

☞	CJEU C-444/17 ***Arib v. FRA***	19 Mar.	2019	Art. 2(2)(a)
☞	CJEU C-175/17 ***X. v. NL***	26 Sep.	2018	Art. 13
☞	CJEU C-181/16 ***Gnandi v. BEL***	19 June	2018	Art. 5
☞	CJEU C-82/16 ***K.A. a.o. v. BEL***	8 May	2018	Art. 5+11+13
☞	CJEU C-184/16 ***Petrea v. GRE***	14 Sep.	2017	Art. 6(1)
☞	CJEU C-225/16 ***Ouhrami v. NL***	26 July	2017	Art. 11(2)
☞	CJEU C-47/15 ***Affum v. FRA***	7 June	2016	Art. 2(1)+3(2)
☞	CJEU C-290/14 ***Celaj v. ITA***	1 Oct.	2015	
☞	CJEU C-554/13 ***Zh. & O. v. NL***	11 June	2015	Art. 7(4)
☞	CJEU C-38/14 ***Zaizoune v. ESP***	23 Apr.	2015	Art. 4(2)+6(1)
☞	CJEU C-562/13 ***Abdida v. BEL***	18 Dec.	2014	Art. 5+13

☞	CJEU C-249/13 ***Boudjlida v. FRA***	11 Dec.	2014	Art. 6
☞	CJEU C-166/13 ***Mukarubega v. FRA***	5 Nov.	2014	Art. 3+7
☞	CJEU C-473/13 ***Bero & Bouzalmate v. GER***	17 July	2014	Art. 16(1)
☞	CJEU C-474/13 ***Pham v. GER***	17 July	2014	Art. 16(1)
☞	CJEU C-146/14 (PPU) ***Mahdi v. BUL***	5 June	2014	Art. 15
☞	CJEU C-297/12 ***Filev & Osmani v. GER***	19 Sep.	2013	Art. 2(2)(b)+11
☞	CJEU C-383/13 (PPU) ***G. & R. v. NL***	10 Sep.	2013	Art. 15(2)+6
☞	CJEU C-534/11 ***Arslan***	30 May	2013	Art. 2(1)
☞	CJEU C-522/11 ***Mbaye v. ITA***	21 Mar.	2013	Art. 2(2)(b)+7(4)
☞	CJEU C-430/11 ***Sagor v. ITA***	6 Dec.	2012	Art. 2+15+16
☞	CJEU C-329/11 ***Achughbabian v. FRA***	6 Dec.	2011	
☞	CJEU C-61/11 (PPU) ***El Dridi v. ITA***	28 Apr.	2011	Art. 15+16
☞	CJEU C-357/09 (PPU) ***Kadzoev v. BUL***	30 Nov.	2009	Art. 15(4), (5) + (6)
	CJEU pending cases			
☞	CJEU C-233/19 ***B. v. BEL***	pending		Art. 16(1)
☞	CJEU C-808/18 ***Com. v. Hungary***	pending		Art. 5+6+12+13
☞	CJEU C-806/18 ***J.Z. v. NL***	pending		Art. 11(2)
New ☞	CJEU C-402/19 ***L.M. v. BEL***	pending		Art. 5+13
New ☞	CJEU ***M. v. NL***	pending		Art. 3+6+15
New ☞	CJEU C-568/19 ***M.O. v. ESP***	pending		
☞	CJEU C-441/19 ***T.Q. v. NL***	pending		Art. 6+8+10
☞	CJEU C-18/19 ***W.M. v. GER***	pending		Art. 16(1)
New ☞	CJEU C-546/19 ***Westerwaldkreis v. GER***	pending		Art. 2(2)(b)+3(6)

See further: § 3.3

Decision 575/2007 — **Return Programme**

Establishing the Eur. Return Fund as part of the General Programme Solidarity and Management of Migration Flows

* OJ 2007 L 144 — UK opt in

Directive 2011/36 — **Trafficking Persons**

On preventing and combating trafficking in human beings and protecting its victims

* OJ 2011 L 101/1 (Mar. 2011) — impl. date 6 Apr. 2013 — UK opt in

* Replacing Framework Decision 2002/629 (OJ 2002 L 203/1)

Directive 2004/81 — **Trafficking Victims**

Residence permits for TCNs who are victims of trafficking

* OJ 2004 L 261/19 — impl. date 6 Aug. 2004

Directive 2002/90 — **Unauthorized Entry**

Facilitation of unauthorised entry, transit and residence

* OJ 2002 L 328 — impl. date 5 Dec. 2002 — UK opt in

CJEU judgments

☞	CJEU C-218/15 ***Paoletti a.o. v. ITA***	25 May	2016	Art. 1
☞	CJEU C-83/12 ***Vo v. GER***	10 Apr.	2012	Art. 1

See further: § 3.3

ECHR — **Detention - Collective Expulsion**

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

Art. 5 Detention

Prot. 4 Art. 4 Collective Expulsion

* ETS 005 (4 November 1950) — impl. date 31 Aug. 1954

ECtHR Judgments

☞	ECtHR 55352/12 ***Aden Ahmed v. MAL***	23 July	2013	Art. 3+5
☞	ECtHR 10112/16 ***Al Husin v. BOS***	25 June	2019	Art. 5
☞	ECtHR 62824/16 ***V.M. v. UK***	25 Apr.	2019	Art. 5
☞	ECtHR 52548/15 ***K.G. v. BEL***	6 Nov.	2018	Art. 5
☞	ECtHR 23707/15 ***Muzamba Oyaw v. BEL***	4 Apr.	2017	Art. 5 - inadmissable
☞	ECtHR 39061/11 ***Thimothawes v. BEL***	4 Apr.	2017	Art. 5
☞	ECtHR 3342/11 ***Richmond Yaw v. IT***	6 Oct.	2016	Art. 5
☞	ECtHR 53709/11 ***A.F. v. GR***	13 June	2013	Art. 5
☞	ECtHR 13058/11 ***Abdelhakim v. HUN***	23 Oct.	2012	Art. 5
☞	ECtHR 13457/11 ***Ali Said v. HUN***	23 Oct.	2012	Art. 5
☞	ECtHR 50520/09 ***Ahmade v. GR***	25 Sep.	2012	Art. 5
☞	ECtHR 14902/10 ***Mahmundi v. GR***	31 July	2012	Art. 5
☞	ECtHR 27765/09 ***Hirsi v. IT***	21 Feb.	2012	Prot. 4 Art. 4

☞ ECtHR 10816/10 ***Lokpo & Touré v. HUN*** 20 Sep. 2011 Art. 5
See further: § 3.3

3.2 Irregular Migration: Proposed Measures

Directive

Amending Return Directive

* COM (2018) 634, 12 Sep 2018

New Council agreed position in June 2019; no EP position yet

3.3 Irregular Migration: Jurisprudence

case law sorted in alphabetical order

3.3.1 CJEU Judgments on Irregular Migration

☞ CJEU C-562/13 ***Abdida v. Belgium*** 18 Dec. 2014
* interpr. of Dir. 2008/115 Return Directive Art. 5+13 ECLI:EU:C:2014:2453
ref. from Cour du Travail de Bruxelles, Belgium, 31 Oct. 2013

* *Although the Belgium court had asked a preliminary ruling on the interpretation of the Qualification Dir., the CJEU re-interpreted the question of an issue of Art. 5 and 13 of the Returns Directive.*
These articles are to be interpreted as precluding national legislation which: (1) does not endow with suspensive effect an appeal against a decision ordering a third country national suffering from a serious illness to leave the territory of a Member State, where the enforcement of that decision may expose that third country national to a serious risk of grave and irreversible deterioration in his state of health, and (2) does not make provision, in so far as possible, for the basic needs of such a third country national to be met, in order to ensure that that person may in fact avail himself of emergency health care and essential treatment of illness during the period in which that Member State is required to postpone removal of the third country national following the lodging of the appeal.

☞ CJEU C-329/11 ***Achughbabian v. France*** 6 Dec. 2011
* interpr. of Dir. 2008/115 Return Directive ECLI:EU:C:2011:807
ref. from Court d'Appel de Paris, France, 29 June 2011

* *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.*

☞ CJEU C-47/15 ***Affum v. France*** 7 June 2016
* interpr. of Dir. 2008/115 Return Directive Art. 2(1)+3(2) ECLI:EU:C:2016:408
ref. from Cour de Cassation , France, 6 Feb. 2015

* *Art. 2(1) and 3(2) must be interpreted as meaning that a TCN is staying illegally on the territory of a MS and therefore falls within the scope of that directive when, without fulfilling the conditions for entry, stay or residence, he passes in transit through that MS as a passenger on a bus from another MS forming part of the Schengen area and bound for a third MS outside that area. Also, the Directive must be interpreted as precluding legislation of a MS which permits a TCN in respect of whom the return procedure established by the directive has not yet been completed to be imprisoned merely on account of illegal entry across an internal border, resulting in an illegal stay. That interpretation also applies where the national concerned may be taken back by another MS pursuant to an agreement or arrangement within the meaning of Art. 6(3).*

☞ CJEU C-444/17 ***Arib v. France*** 19 Mar. 2019
* interpr. of Dir. 2008/115 Return Directive Art. 2(2)(a) ECLI:EU:C:2019:220
ref. from Cour de Cassation , France, 21 July 2017

* *Article 2(2)(a) of Dir. 2008/115 read in conjunction with Art. 32 of Regulation 2016/399 (Borders Code), must be interpreted as not applying to the situation of an illegally staying third-country national who was apprehended in the immediate vicinity of an internal border of a Member State, even where that Member State has reintroduced border control at that border, pursuant to Article 25 of the regulation, on account of a serious threat to public policy or internal security in that Member State.*

☞ CJEU C-534/11 ***Arslan*** 30 May 2013
* interpr. of Dir. 2008/115 Return Directive Art. 2(1) ECLI:EU:C:2013:343
ref. from Nejvyšší správní soud, Czech, 20 Oct. 2011

* *The Return Directive 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.*

☞ CJEU C-473/13 ***Bero & Bouzalmate v. Germany*** 17 July 2014
* interpr. of Dir. 2008/115 Return Directive Art. 16(1) ECLI:EU:C:2014:2095
ref. from Bundesgerichtshof, Germany, 3 Sep. 2013

* joined case with C-514/13

* *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-249/13 — ***Boudjlida v. France*** — 11 Dec. 2014
* interpr. of Dir. 2008/115 — Return Directive Art. 6 — ECLI:EU:C:2014:2431
ref. from Tribunal administratif de Pau, France, 6 May 2013

* *The right to be heard in all proceedings (in particular, Art 6), must be interpreted as extending to the right of an illegally staying third-country national to express, before the adoption of a return decision concerning him, his point of view on the legality of his stay, on the possible application of Art 5 and 6(2) to (5) and on the detailed arrangements for his return.*

☞ CJEU C-290/14 — ***Celaj v. Italy*** — 1 Oct. 2015
* interpr. of Dir. 2008/115 — Return Directive — ECLI:EU:C:2015:640
ref. from Tribunale di Firenze, Italy, 12 June 2014

* *The Directive must be interpreted as not, in principle, precluding legislation of a MS which provides for the imposition of a prison sentence on an illegally staying third-country national who, after having been returned to his country of origin in the context of an earlier return procedure, unlawfully re-enters the territory of that State in breach of an entry ban, at least in cases of re-entry in breach of an entry ban.*

☞ CJEU C-61/11 (PPU) — ***El Dridi v. Italy*** — 28 Apr. 2011
* interpr. of Dir. 2008/115 — Return Directive Art. 15+16 — ECLI:EU:C:2011:268
ref. from Corte D'Appello Di Trento, Italy, 10 Feb. 2011

* *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-297/12 — ***Filev & Osmani v. Germany*** — 19 Sep. 2013
* interpr. of Dir. 2008/115 — Return Directive Art. 2(2)(b)+11 — ECLI:EU:C:2013:569
ref. from Amtsgericht Laufen, Germany, 18 June 2012

* *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. & R. v. NL*** — 10 Sep. 2013
* interpr. of Dir. 2008/115 — Return Directive Art. 15(2)+6 — ECLI:EU:C:2013:533
ref. from Raad van State, NL, 5 July 2013

* *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-181/16 — ***Gnandi v. Belgium*** — 19 June 2018
* interpr. of Dir. 2008/115 — Return Directive Art. 5 — ECLI:EU:C:2018:465
ref. from Conseil d'Etat, Belgium, 31 Mar. 2016

* *Member States are entitled to adopt a return decision as soon as an application for international protection is rejected, provided that the return procedure is suspended pending the outcome of an appeal against that rejection.*
Member States are required to provide an effective remedy against the decision rejecting the application for international protection, in accordance with the principle of equality of arms, which means, in particular, that all the effects of the return decision must be suspended during the period prescribed for lodging such an appeal and, if such an appeal is lodged, until resolution of the appeal.

☞ CJEU C-82/16 — ***K.A. a.o. v. Belgium*** — 8 May 2018
* interpr. of Dir. 2008/115 — Return Directive Art. 5+11+13 — ECLI:EU:C:2018:308
ref. from Raad voor Vreemdelingenbetwistingen, Belgium, 12 Feb. 2016

* *Art. 5 and 11 must be interpreted as not precluding a practice of a MS that consists in not examining an application for residence for the purposes of family reunification, submitted on its territory by a TCN family member of a Union citizen who is a national of that MS and who has never exercised his or her right to freedom of movement, solely on the ground that that TCN is the subject of a ban on entering the territory of that Member State.*
Art. 5 must be interpreted as precluding a national practice pursuant to which a return decision is adopted with respect to a TCN, who has previously been the subject of a return decision, accompanied by an entry ban that remains in force, without any account being taken of the details of his or her family life, and in particular the interests of a minor child of that TCN, referred to in an application for residence for the purposes of family reunification submitted after the adoption of such an entry ban, unless such details could have been provided earlier by the person concerned.

☞ CJEU C-357/09 (PPU) — ***Kadzoev v. Bulgaria*** — 30 Nov. 2009
* interpr. of Dir. 2008/115 — Return Directive Art. 15(4), (5) + (6) — ECLI:EU:C:2009:741
ref. from Administrativen sad Sofia-grad, Bulgaria, 7 Sep. 2009

* *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.

☞ CJEU C-146/14 (PPU) — ***Mahdi v. Bulgaria*** — 5 June 2014
* interpr. of Dir. 2008/115 — Return Directive Art. 15 — ECLI:EU:C:2014:1320
ref. from Administrativen sad Sofia-grad, Bulgaria, 28 Mar. 2014
* *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 v. Italy*** — 21 Mar. 2013
* interpr. of Dir. 2008/115 — Return Directive Art. 2(2)(b)+7(4) — ECLI:EU:C:2013:190
ref. from Ufficio del Giudice di Pace Lecce, Italy, 22 Sep. 2011
* *Third-country nationals prosecuted for or convicted of the offence of illegal residence provided for in the legislation of a Member State cannot, on account solely of that offence of illegal residence, be excluded from the scope of Directive 2008/115.*
Directive 2008/115 does not preclude legislation of a Member State penalising the illegal residence of third-country nationals by a fine which may be replaced by expulsion. However, it is only possible to have recourse to that option to replace the fine where the situation of the person concerned corresponds to one of those referred to in Article 7 (4) of that directive.

☞ CJEU C-166/13 — ***Mukarubega v. France*** — 5 Nov. 2014
* interpr. of Dir. 2008/115 — Return Directive Art. 3+7 — ECLI:EU:C:2014:2336
ref. from Tribunal Administratif de Melun, France, 3 Apr. 2013
* *A national authority is not precluded from failing to hear a TCN specifically on the subject of a return decision where, after that authority has determined that the TCN is staying illegally in the national territory on the conclusion of a procedure which fully respected that person's right to be heard, it is contemplating the adoption of such a decision in respect of that person, whether or not that return decision is the result of refusal of a residence permit.*

☞ CJEU C-456/14 — ***Orrego Arias v. Spain*** — 3 Sep. 2015
* interpr. of Dir. 2001/40 — Expulsion Decisions Art. 3(1)(a) - — ECLI:EU:C:2015:550
ref. from Tribunal Superior de Justicia of Castilla La Mancha , Spain, 2 Oct. 2014
* *This case concerns the exact meaning of the term 'offence punishable by a penalty involving deprivation of liberty of at least one year', set out in Art 3(1)(a). However, the question was incorrectly formulated. Consequently, the Court ordered that the case was inadmissable.*

☞ CJEU C-225/16 — ***Ouhrami v. NL*** — 26 July 2017
* interpr. of Dir. 2008/115 — Return Directive Art. 11(2) — ECLI:EU:C:2017:590
ref. from Hoge Raad, NL, 22 Apr. 2016
* *Article 11(2) must be interpreted as meaning that the starting point of the duration of an entry ban, as referred to in that provision, which in principle may not exceed five years, must be calculated from the date on which the person concerned actually left the territory of the Member States.*

☞ CJEU C-218/15 — ***Paoletti a.o. v. Italy*** — 25 May 2016
* interpr. of Dir. 2002/90 — Unauthorized Entry Art. 1 — ECLI:EU:C:2016:748
ref. from Tribunale ordinario di Campobasso, Italy, 11 May 2015
* *Article 6 TEU and Article 49 of the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union must be interpreted as meaning that the accession of a State to the European Union does not preclude another Member State imposing a criminal penalty on persons who committed, before the accession, the offence of facilitation of illegal immigration for nationals of the first State.*

☞ CJEU C-184/16 — ***Petrea v. Greece*** — 14 Sep. 2017
* interpr. of Dir. 2008/115 — Return Directive Art. 6(1) — ECLI:EU:C:2017:684
ref. from Dioikitiko Protodikeio Thessalonikis, Greece, 1 Apr. 2016
* *The Return Directive does not preclude a decision to return a EU citizen from being adopted by the same authorities and according to the same procedure as a decision to return a third-country national staying illegally referred to in Article 6(1), provided that the transposition measures of Directive 2004/38 (Citizens Directive) which are more favourable to that EU citizen are applied.*

☞ CJEU C-474/13 — ***Pham v. Germany*** — 17 July 2014
* interpr. of Dir. 2008/115 — Return Directive Art. 16(1) — ECLI:EU:C:2014:2096
ref. from Bundesgerichtshof, Germany, 3 Sep. 2013
* *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 v. Italy*** — 6 Dec. 2012
* interpr. of Dir. 2008/115 — Return Directive Art. 2+15+16 — ECLI:EU:C:2012:777
ref. from Tribunale di Adria, Italy, 18 Aug. 2011
* *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-83/12 — ***Vo v. Germany*** — 10 Apr. 2012
* interpr. of Dir. 2002/90 — Unauthorized Entry Art. 1 — ECLI:EU:C:2012:202
ref. from Bundesgerichtshof, Germany, 17 Feb. 2012
* *The Visa Code is to be interpreted as meaning that is does not preclude national provisions under which assisting illegal immigration constitutes an offence subject to criminal penalties in cases where the persons smuggled, third−country nationals, hold visas which they obtained fraudulently by deceiving the competent authorities of the Member State of issue as to the true purpose of their journey, without prior annulment of those visas.*

☞ CJEU C-175/17 — ***X. v. NL*** — 26 Sep. 2018
* interpr. of Dir. 2008/115 — Return Directive Art. 13 — ECLI:EU:C:2018:776
ref. from Raad van State, NL, 6 Apr. 2017
* joined case with C-180/17
* *An appeal against a judgment delivered at first instance upholding a decision rejecting an application for international protection and imposing an obligation to return, does not confer on that remedy automatic suspensory effect even in the case where the person concerned invokes a serious risk of infringement of the principle of non-refoulement.*

☞ CJEU C-38/14 — ***Zaizoune v. Spain*** — 23 Apr. 2015
* interpr. of Dir. 2008/115 — Return Directive Art. 4(2)+6(1) — ECLI:EU:C:2015:260
ref. from Tribunal Superior de Justicia del Pais Vasco, Spain, 27 Jan. 2014
* *Articles 6(1) and 8(1), read in conjunction with Article 4(2) and 4(3), must be interpreted as precluding legislation of a MS, which provides, in the event of TCNs illegally staying in the territory of that Member State, depending on the circumstances, for either a fine or removal, since the two measures are mutually exclusive.*

☞ CJEU C-554/13 — ***Zh. & O. v. NL*** — 11 June 2015
* interpr. of Dir. 2008/115 — Return Directive Art. 7(4) — ECLI:EU:C:2015:377
ref. from Raad van State, NL, 28 Oct. 2013
* *(1) Article 7(4) must be interpreted as precluding a national practice whereby a third-country national, who is staying illegally within the territory of a Member State, is deemed to pose a risk to public policy within the meaning of that provision on the sole ground that that national is suspected, or has been criminally convicted, of an act punishable as a criminal offence under national law.*
(2) Article 7(4) must be interpreted to the effect that, in the case of a TCN who is staying illegally within the territory of a MS and is suspected, or has been criminally convicted, of an act punishable as a criminal offence under national law, other factors, such as the nature and seriousness of that act, the time which has elapsed since it was committed and the fact that that national was in the process of leaving the territory of that MS when he was detained by the national authorities, may be relevant in the assessment of whether he poses a risk to public policy within the meaning of that provision. Any matter which relates to the reliability of the suspicion that the third-country national concerned committed the alleged criminal offence, as the case may be, is also relevant to that assessment.
(3) Article 7(4) must be interpreted as meaning that it is not necessary, in order to make use of the option offered by that provision to refrain from granting a period for voluntary departure when the third-country national poses a risk to public policy, to conduct a fresh examination of the matters which have already been examined in order to establish the existence of that risk. Any legislation or practice of a MS on this issue must nevertheless ensure that a case-by-case assessment is conducted of whether the refusal to grant such a period is compatible with that person's fundamental rights.

3.3.2 CJEU pending cases on Irregular Migration

☞ CJEU C-233/19 — ***B. v. Belgium***
* interpr. of Dir. 2008/115 — Return Directive Art. 16(1)
ref. from Cour du Travail de Liege, Belgium, 18 Mar. 2019
* *Must Articles 5 and 13 read in the light of the judgment in Abdida (C-562/13), be interpreted as endowing with suspensive effect an appeal brought against a decision ordering a third-country national suffering from a serious illness to leave the territory of a Member State, in the case where the appellant claims that the enforcement of that decision is liable to expose him to a serious risk of grave and irreversible deterioration in his state of health?*

☞ CJEU C-808/18 — ***Com. v. Hungary***
* interpr. of Dir. 2008/115 — Return Directive Art. 5+6+12+13
ref. from European Commission, EU, 21 Dec. 2018
* *Whether Hungary has failed to fulfil its obligations under the Return Directive and the Charter.*

☞ CJEU C-806/18 — ***J.Z. v. NL***
* interpr. of Dir. 2008/115 — Return Directive Art. 11(2)
ref. from Hoge Raad, NL, 23 Nov. 2018
* *Follow up on the Ouhrami case (C-225/16) of 26 July 2017 on the consequences of an entry ban if the alien has not (yet) left the territory of the MS.*

New ☞ CJEU C-402/19 — ***L.M. v. Belgium***
* interpr. of Dir. 2008/115 — Return Directive Art. 5+13
ref. from Cour du Travail de Liege, Belgium, 24 May 2019
* *Does point 1 of the first subparagraph of Art. 57(2) of the Organic Law of 8 July 1976 on public social welfare centres infringe Arts. 5 and 13 of the Return Directive read in the light of Arts. 19(2) and 47 of the Charter, and Art.*

14(1)(b) of the Return Directive and Arts. 7 and (21) of the Charter as interpreted by the CJEU (in the Abdida judgment of 18 Dec. 2014, Case C-562/13):
first, in so far as it results in depriving a TCN, staying illegally on the territory of a MS, of provision, in so far as possible, for his basic needs pending resolution of the action for suspension and annulment that he has brought in his own name as the representative of his child, who was at that time a minor, against a decision ordering them to leave the territory of a MS;
where, second, on the one hand, that child who has now come of age suffers from a serious illness and the enforcement of that decision may expose that child to a serious risk of grave and irreversible deterioration in her state of health and, on the other, the presence of that parent alongside his daughter who has now come of age is considered to be imperative by the medical professional given that she is particularly vulnerable as a result of her state of health (recurrent sickle cell crises and the need for surgery in order to prevent paralysis)?

New

☞ CJEU unknown — ***M. v. NL***
* interpr. of Dir. 2008/115 — Return Directive Art. 3+6+15
ref. from Raad van State, NL, 4 Sep. 2019
* *Is the Return Directive applicable in cases of removal of TCN with international protection in another MS to that MS?*

New

☞ CJEU C-568/19 — ***M.O. v. Spain***
* interpr. of Dir. 2008/115 — Return Directive
ref. from Tribunal Superior de Justicia of Castilla La Mancha , Spain,
* *On the issue whether Spanish legislation, which penalises illegal stay, is compatible with the Return Directive and in particular with the interpretation of the CJEU in Zaizoune (C-38/14).*

☞ CJEU C-441/19 — ***T.Q. v. NL***
* interpr. of Dir. 2008/115 — Return Directive Art. 6+8+10
ref. from Rechtbank Den Haag (zp) Den Bosch, NL, 12 June 2019
* *On the enforcement of return decisions and unaccompanied minors.*

☞ CJEU C-18/19 — ***W.M. v. Germany***
* interpr. of Dir. 2008/115 — Return Directive Art. 16(1)
ref. from Bundesgerichtshof, Germany, 11 Jan. 2019
* *Does Article 16(1) preclude national provisions under which custody awaiting deportation may be enforced in an ordinary custodial institution if the foreign national poses a significant threat to the life and limb of others or to significant internal security interests, in which case the detainee awaiting deportation is accommodated separately from prisoners serving criminal sentences?*

New

☞ CJEU C-546/19 — ***Westerwaldkreis v. Germany***
* interpr. of Dir. 2008/115 — Return Directive Art. 2(2)(b)+3(6)
ref. from Bundesverwaltungsgericht, Germany,
* *On the issue whether an entry ban falls within the scope of the Return Directive if the reasons for this ban are not related to migration. And what is the consequence of lifting a return decision on the legitimacy of the corresponding entry ban?*

3.3.3 ECtHR Judgments on Irregular Migration

☞ ECtHR 53709/11 — ***A.F. v. GR*** — 13 June 2013
* violation of — ECHR: Art. 5 — ECLI:CE:ECHR:2013:0613JUD005370911
* *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 13058/11 — ***Abdelhakim v. HUN*** — 23 Oct. 2012
* violation of — ECHR: Art. 5 — ECLI:CE:ECHR:2012:1023JUD001305811
* *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 50520/09 — ***Ahmade v. GR*** — 25 Sep. 2012
* violation of — ECHR: Art. 5 — ECLI:CE:ECHR:2012:0925JUD005052009
* *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 59727/13 ***Ahmed v. UK*** 2 Mar. 2017
* no violation of ECHR: Art. 5(1) ECLI:CE:ECHR:2017:0302JUD005972713
* *A fifteen year old Somali asylum seeker gets a temporary residence permit in The Netherlands in 1992. After 6 years (1998) he travels to the UK and applies - again - for asylum but under a false name. The asylum request is rejected but he is allowed to stay (with family) in the UK in 2004. In 2007 he is sentenced to four and a half months' imprisonment and also faced with a deportation order in 2008. After the Sufi and Elmi judgment (8319/07) the Somali is released on bail in 2011. The Court states that the periods of time taken by the Government to decide on his appeals against the deportation orders were reasonable.*

☞ ECtHR 10112/16 ***Al Husin v. BOS*** 25 June 2019
* violation of ECHR: Art. 5 ECLI:CE:ECHR:2019:0625JUD001011216
* *The applicant was born in Syria in 1963. He fought as part of a foreign mujahedin unit on the Bosnian side during the 1992-95 war. At some point he obtained citizenship of Bosnia and Herzegovina, but this was revoked in 2007. He was placed in an immigration detention centre in October 2008 as a threat to national security. He claimed asylum, but this was dismissed and a deportation order was issued in February 2011. The applicant lodged a first application to the ECtHR, which found that he faced a violation of his rights if he were to be deported to Syria. The authorities issued a new deportation order in March 2012 and proceeded over the following years to extend his detention on national security grounds. In the meantime, the authorities tried to find a safe third country to deport him to, but many countries in Europe and the Middle East refused to accept him.*
In February 2016 he was released subject to restrictions, such as a ban on leaving his area of residence and having to report to the police. The Court concluded that the grounds for the applicant's detention had not remained valid for the whole period of his detention owing to the lack of a realistic prospect of his expulsion. There had therefore been a violation of his rights under Article 5(1)(f).

☞ ECtHR 13457/11 ***Ali Said v. HUN*** 23 Oct. 2012
* violation of ECHR: Art. 5 ECLI:CE:ECHR:2012:1023JUD001345711
* *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 27765/09 ***Hirsi v. IT*** 21 Feb. 2012
* violation of ECHR: Prot. 4 Art. 4 ECLI:CE:ECHR:2012:0221JUD002776509
* *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 52548/15 ***K.G. v. BEL*** 6 Nov. 2018
* no violation of ECHR: Art. 5 ECLI:CE:ECHR:2018:1106JUD005254815
* *The applicant, a Sri Lankan national, arrived in Belgium in October 2009. He lodged eight asylum applications, alleging that he had been subjected to torture in Sri Lanka because he belonged to the Tamil minority. His requests were rejected and he was issued with a number of orders to leave Belgium but did not comply. In January 2011 he was sentenced to 18 months' imprisonment, for the offence of indecent assault committed with violence or threats against a minor under 16. In October 2014 he was notified that he was banned from entering Belgium for six years on the ground that he constituted a serious threat to public order. The decision of the Aliens Office referred, among other points, to his conviction, to police reports showing that he had committed the offences of assault, shop-lifting, and contact with minors, and also to the orders to leave Belgium with which he had not complied. He was then placed in a detention centre.*
The Court stressed that the case had involved important considerations concerning the clarification of the risks actually facing the applicant in Sri Lanka, the protection of public safety in view of the serious offences of which he had been accused and the risk of a repeat offence, and also the applicant's mental health. The interests of the applicant and the public interest in the proper administration of justice had justified careful scrutiny by the authorities of all the relevant aspects and evidence and in particular the examination, by bodies that afforded safeguards against arbitrariness, of the evidence regarding the threat to national security and the applicant's health. The Court therefore considered, that the length of time for which the applicant had been at the Government's disposal – approximately 13 months – could not be regarded as excessive.

☞ ECtHR 10816/10 ***Lokpo & Touré v. HUN*** 20 Sep. 2011
* violation of ECHR: Art. 5 ECLI:CE:ECHR:2011:0920JUD001081610
* *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 14902/10 ***Mahmundi v. GR*** 31 July 2012
* violation of ECHR: Art. 5 ECLI:CE:ECHR:2012:0731JUD001490210

* *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.

☞ ECtHR 23707/15 ***Muzamba Oyaw v. BEL*** 4 Apr. 2017
* no violation of ECHR: Art. 5 - inadmissable ECLI:CE:ECHR:2017:0404JUD002370715
* *The applicant is a Congolese national who is in administrative detention awaiting his deportation while his (Belgian) partner is pregnant. The ECtHR found his complaint under Article 5 § 1 manifestly ill-founded since his detention was justified for the purposes of deportation, the domestic courts had adequately assessed the necessity of the detention and its duration (less than three months) had not been excessive.*

☞ ECtHR 3342/11 ***Richmond Yaw v. IT*** 6 Oct. 2016
* violation of ECHR: Art. 5 ECLI:CE:ECHR:2016:1006JUD000334211
* *The case concerns the placement in detention of four Ghanaian nationals pending their removal from Italy. The applicants arrived in Italy in June 2008 after fleeing inter-religious clashes in Ghana. On 20 November 2008 deportation orders were issued with a view to their removal. This order for detention was upheld on 24 November 2008 by the justice of the peace and extended, on 17 December 2008, by 30 days without the applicants or their lawyer being informed. They were released on 14 January 2009 and the deportation order was withdrawn in June 2010. In June 2010 the Court of Cassation declared the detention order of 17 December 2008 null and void on the ground that it had been adopted without a hearing and in the absence of the applicants and their lawyer.*
Their subsequent claims for compensation for the damage were dismissed by the Rome District Court.

☞ ECtHR 39061/11 ***Thimothawes v. BEL*** 4 Apr. 2017
* no violation of ECHR: Art. 5 ECLI:CE:ECHR:2017:0404JUD003906111
* *The case concerned an Egyptian asylum-seeker who was detained in Belgium awaiting his deportation after his asylum request was rejected. After a maximum administrative detention period of 5 months he was released. With this (majority) judgment the Court acquits the Belgian State of the charge of having breached the right to liberty under article 5(1) by systematically detaining asylum seekers at its external border at the national airport.*

☞ ECtHR 62824/16 ***V.M. v. UK*** 25 Apr. 2019
* violation of ECHR: Art. 5 ECLI:CE:ECHR:2019:0425JUD006282416
* see also: ECtHR 1 Sep 2016, 49734/12, V.M. v. UK
* *The applicant claims to have entered the UK illegally in 2003. On offences of cruelty towards her son, she is sentenced to twelve months imprisonment and the recommendation to be deported. After the end of her criminal sentence she was detained under immigration powers with the intention to deport her. She first complained with the ECtHR in 2012 about her detention (of 34 months) and the ECtHR found (in 2016) a violation of Art. 5(1) in the light of the authorities' delay in considering the applicant's further representations in the context of her claim for asylum. In the end she is not deported but released.*
This procedure is her second complaint with the ECtHR and concerns the latter part of her detention under different litigation proceedings which had not yet ended during the first judgment of the Court. The applicant complained under Article 5 of the Convention that her detention had been arbitrary as the authorities had failed to act with appropriate "due diligence". Although six reviews of the applicant's detention were written by the applicant's 'caseworker' and several reports by doctors supporting an immediate release, these requests were filed as "yet another psychiatric report" which wer treated as a further request to revoke the deportation order.
The Court rules that the applicant was unlawfully detained due to the deficiencies in her detention reviews; the need to redress that unlawfulness was not lessened because the State did not make appropriate arrangements for her release during that period.

4 External Treaties

4.1 External Treaties: Association Agreements

case law sorted in chronological order

EEC-Turkey Association Agreement

* OJ 1964 217/3687
* into force 23 Dec. 1963

EEC-Turkey Association Agreement Additional Protocol

* OJ 1972 L 293
* into force 1 Jan. 1973

EEC-Turkey Association Agreement Decision 2/76

* Dec. 2/76 of 20 December 1976 on the implementation of Article 12 of the Ankara Agreement

EEC-Turkey Association Agreement Decision 1/80

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

CJEU judgments

New	☞	CJEU C-89/18 ***A. v. DEN***	10 July	2019	Art. 13
	☞	CJEU C-123/17 ***Yön v. GER***	7 Aug.	2018	Art. 13
	☞	CJEU C-652/15 ***Tekdemir v. GER***	29 Mar.	2017	Art. 13
	☞	CJEU C-508/15 ***Ucar a.o. v. GER***	21 Dec.	2016	Art. 7
	☞	CJEU C-91/13 ***Essent v. NL***	11 Sep.	2014	Art. 13
	☞	CJEU C-225/12 ***Demir v. NL***	7 Nov.	2013	Art. 13
	☞	CJEU C-268/11 ***Gühlbahce v. GER***	8 Nov.	2012	Art. 6(1)+10
	☞	CJEU C-451/11 ***Dülger v. GER***	19 July	2012	Art. 7
	☞	CJEU C-7/10 ***Kahveci & Inan v. NL***	29 Mar.	2012	Art. 7
	☞	CJEU C-371/08 ***Ziebell or Örnek v. GER***	8 Dec.	2011	Art. 14(1)
	☞	CJEU C-256/11 ***Dereci et al. v. AUT***	15 Nov.	2011	Art. 13
	☞	CJEU C-187/10 ***Unal v. NL***	29 Sep.	2011	Art. 6(1)
	☞	CJEU C-484/07 ***Pehlivan v. NL***	16 June	2011	Art. 7
	☞	CJEU C-303/08 ***Metin Bozkurt v. GER***	22 Dec.	2010	Art. 7+14(1)
	☞	CJEU C-300/09 ***Toprak & Oguz v. NL***	9 Dec.	2010	Art. 13
	☞	CJEU C-92/07 ***Com. v. NL***	29 Apr.	2010	Art. 10(1)+13
	☞	CJEU C-14/09 ***Genc (Hava) v. GER***	4 Feb.	2010	Art. 6(1)
	☞	CJEU C-462/08 ***Bekleyen v. GER***	21 Jan.	2010	Art. 7(2)
	☞	CJEU C-242/06 ***Sahin v. NL***	17 Sep.	2009	Art. 13
	☞	CJEU C-337/07 ***Altun v. GER***	18 Dec.	2008	Art. 7
	☞	CJEU C-453/07 ***Er v. GER***	25 Sep.	2008	Art. 7
	☞	CJEU C-294/06 ***Payir v. UK***	24 Jan.	2008	Art. 6(1)
	☞	CJEU C-349/06 ***Polat v. GER***	4 Oct.	2007	Art. 7+14
	☞	CJEU C-325/05 ***Derin v. GER***	18 July	2007	Art. 6, 7 and 14
	☞	CJEU C-4/05 ***Güzeli v. GER***	26 Oct.	2006	Art. 6
	☞	CJEU C-502/04 ***Torun v. GER***	16 Feb.	2006	Art. 7
	☞	CJEU C-230/03 ***Sedef v. GER***	10 Jan.	2006	Art. 6
	☞	CJEU C-373/03 ***Aydinli v. GER***	7 July	2005	Art. 6+7
	☞	CJEU C-383/03 ***Dogan (Ergül) v. AUT***	7 July	2005	Art. 6(1) + (2)
	☞	CJEU C-374/03 ***Gürol v. GER***	7 July	2005	Art. 9
	☞	CJEU C-136/03 ***Dörr & Unal v. AUT***	2 June	2005	Art. 6(1)+14(1)
	☞	CJEU C-467/02 ***Cetinkaya v. GER***	11 Nov.	2004	Art. 7+14(1)
	☞	CJEU C-275/02 ***Ayaz v. GER***	30 Sep.	2004	Art. 7
	☞	CJEU C-465/01 ***Com. v. Austria***	16 Sep.	2004	Art. 10(1)
	☞	CJEU C-317/01 ***Abatay & Sahin v. GER***	21 Oct.	2003	Art. 13+41(1)
	☞	CJEU C-171/01 ***Birlikte v. AUT***	8 May	2003	Art. 10(1)
	☞	CJEU C-188/00 ***Kurz (Yuze) v. GER***	19 Nov.	2002	Art. 6(1)+7
	☞	CJEU C-89/00 ***Bicakci v. GER***	19 Sep.	2000	
	☞	CJEU C-65/98 ***Eyüp v. AUT***	22 June	2000	Art. 7(1)
	☞	CJEU C-329/97 ***Ergat v. GER***	16 Mar.	2000	Art. 7

☞ CJEU C-340/97 ***Nazli v. GER***	10 Feb.	2000	Art. 6(1)+14(1)
☞ CJEU C-1/97 ***Birden v. GER***	26 Nov.	1998	Art. 6(1)
☞ CJEU C-210/97 ***Akman v. GER***	19 Nov.	1998	Art. 7
☞ CJEU C-98/96 ***Ertanir v. GER***	30 Sep.	1997	Art. 6(1)+6(3)
☞ CJEU C-36/96 ***Günaydin v. GER***	30 Sep.	1997	Art. 6(1)
☞ CJEU C-285/95 ***Kol v. GER***	5 June	1997	Art. 6(1)
☞ CJEU C-386/95 ***Eker v. GER***	29 May	1997	Art. 6(1)
☞ CJEU C-351/95 ***Kadiman v. GER***	17 Apr.	1997	Art. 7
☞ CJEU C-171/95 ***Tetik v. GER***	23 Jan.	1997	Art. 6(1)
☞ CJEU C-434/93 ***Ahmet Bozkurt v. NL***	6 June	1995	Art. 6(1)
☞ CJEU C-355/93 ***Eroglu v. GER***	5 Oct.	1994	Art. 6(1)
☞ CJEU C-237/91 ***Kus v. GER***	16 Dec.	1992	Art. 6(1)+6(3)
☞ CJEU C-192/89 ***Sevince v. NL***	20 Sep.	1990	Art. 6(1)+13
☞ CJEU C-12/86 ***Demirel v. GER***	30 Sep.	1987	Art. 7+12
CJEU pending cases			
☞ CJEU C-70/18 ***A.B. & P. v. NL***	pending		Art. 13
See further: § 4.4			

EEC-Turkey Association Agreement Decision 3/80

* Dec. 3/80 of 19 Sept. 1980 on Social Security

CJEU judgments			
☞ CJEU C-677/17 ***Çoban v. NL***	15 May	2019	Art. 6(1)
☞ CJEU C-171/13 ***Demirci a.o. v. NL***	14 Jan.	2015	Art. 6(1)
☞ CJEU C-485/07 ***Akdas v. NL***	26 May	2011	Art. 6(1)
CJEU pending cases			
☞ CJEU C-257/18 ***Güler & Solak v. NL***	pending		Art. 6
See further: § 4.4			

4.2 External Treaties: Readmission

Albania

* OJ 2005 L 124/21 (into force 1 May 2006 (TCN: May 2008)) — UK opt in

Armenia

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

Azerbaijan

* OJ 2014 L 128/17 (into force 1 Sept. 2014)

Belarus

* Mobility partnership signed in 2014

Bosnia and Herzegovina

* OJ 2007 L 334/66 (into force 1 Jan. 2008 (TCN: Jan. 2010)) — UK opt in

Cape Verde

* OJ 2013 L 282/15 (into force 1 Dec. 2014)

Georgia

* OJ 2011 L 52/47 (into force 1 March 2011) — UK opt in
EC proposes to lift visa requirements, March 2016

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

Macedonia

* OJ 2007 L 334/7 (into force 1 Jan. 2008 (TCN: Jan. 2010)) — UK opt in

Moldova

* OJ 2007 L 334/149 (into force 1 Jan. 2008 (TCN: Jan. 2010)) — UK opt in

Montenegro

* OJ 2007 L 334/26 (into force 1 Jan. 2008 (TCN: Jan. 2010)) — UK opt in

Morocco, Algeria, and China

* negotiation mandate approved by Council

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

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

Serbia
* OJ 2007 L 334/46 (into force 1 Jan. 2008 (TCN: Jan. 2010)) UK opt in

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

Turkey
* Com (2012) 239 (into force 1 Oct. 2014)
  Additional provisions as of 1 June 2016

Ukraine
* OJ 2007 L 332/48 (into force 1 Jan. 2008 (TCN: Jan. 2010)) UK opt in

Turkey (Statement)
* Not published in OJ - only Press Release (18 March 2016)

CJEU judgments

☞ CJEU T-192/16 ***N.F. v. European Council*** 27 Feb. 2017 inadm.
See further: § 4.4

4.3 External Treaties: Other

Armenia: visa
* OJ 2013 L 289 (into force 1 Jan. 2014)

Azerbaijan: visa
* OJ 2013 L 320/7 (into force 1 Sep. 2014)

Belarus: visa
* council mandate to negotiate, Feb. 2011

Brazil: short-stay visa waiver for holders of diplomatic or official passports
* OJ 2011 L 66/1 (into force 24 Feb. 2011)

Brazil: short-stay visa waiver for holders of ordinary passports
* OJ 2012 L 255/3 (into force 1 Oct. 2012)

Cape Verde: visa
* OJ 2013 L 282/3 (into force 1 Dec. 2014)

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)

Mauritius, Antigua/Barbuda, Barbados, Seychelles, St. Kitts and Nevis and Bahamas: visa abolition
* OJ 2009 L 169 (into force, May 2009)

Moldova: visa
* OJ 2013 L 168 (into force 1 July 2013)

Morocco: visa
* proposals to negotiate - approved by council Dec. 2013

Norway and Iceland: Dublin Convention
* OJ 1999 L 176/36 (into force 1 March 2001)
* Protocol into force 1 May 2006

Russia: Visa facilitation
* Council mandate to renegotiate visa facilitation treaties, April 2011

Switzerland: Free Movement of Persons
* OJ 2002 L 114 (into force 1 June 2002)

Switzerland: Implementation of Schengen, Dublin
* OJ 2008 L 83/37 (applied from Dec. 2008)

4.4 External Treaties: Jurisprudence

case law sorted in alphabetical order

4.4.1 CJEU Judgments on EEC-Turkey Association Agreement

New

☞ CJEU C-89/18 — ***A. v. Denmark*** — 10 July 2019
* interpr. of — Dec. 1/80: Art. 13 — ECLI:EU:C:2019:580
ref. from Ostre Landsret, Denmark, 8 Feb. 2018
* *Art. 13 Dec. 1/80, must be interpreted as meaning that a national measure which makes family reunification between a Turkish worker legally resident in the MS concerned and his spouse conditional upon their overall attachment to that MS being greater than their overall attachment to a third country, constitutes a 'new restriction', within the meaning of that provision. Such a restriction is unjustified.*

☞ CJEU C-317/01 — ***Abatay & Sahin v. Germany*** — 21 Oct. 2003
* interpr. of — Dec. 1/80: Art. 13+41(1) — ECLI:EU:C:2003:572
ref. from Bundessozialgericht, Germany, 13 Aug. 2001
* joined case with C-369/01
* *Art. 41(1) Add. Protocol and Art. 13 Dec. 1/80 have direct effect and prohibit generally the introduction of new national restrictions on the right of establishment and the freedom to provide services and freedom of movement for workers from the date of the entry into force in the host Member State of the legal measure of which those articles are part (scope standstill obligation).*

☞ CJEU C-434/93 — ***Ahmet Bozkurt v. NL*** — 6 June 1995
* interpr. of — Dec. 1/80: Art. 6(1) — ECLI:EU:C:1995:168
ref. from Raad van State, NL, 4 Nov. 1993
* *In order to ascertain whether a Turkish worker belongs to the legitimate labour force of a Member State, for the purposes of Art. 6(1) of Dec.1/80 it is for the national court to determine whether the applicant's employment relationship retained a sufficiently close link with the territory of the Member State, and, in so doing, to take account, in particular, of the place where he was hired, the territory on which the paid employment is based and the applicable national legislation in the field of employment and social security law.*
The existence of legal employment in a Member State within the meaning of Art. 6(1) of Dec. 1/80 can be established in the case of a Turkish worker who was not required by the national legislation concerned to hold a work permit or a residence permit issued by the authorities in the host State in order to carry out his work. The fact that such employment exists necessarily implies the recognition of a right of residence for the person concerned.

☞ CJEU C-485/07 — ***Akdas v. NL*** — 26 May 2011
* interpr. of — Dec. 3/80: Art. 6(1) — ECLI:EU:C:2011:346
ref. from Centrale Raad van Beroep, NL, 5 Nov. 2007
* *Supplements to social security can not be withdrawn solely on the ground that the beneficiary has moved out of the Member State.*

☞ CJEU C-210/97 — ***Akman v. Germany*** — 19 Nov. 1998
* interpr. of — Dec. 1/80: Art. 7 — ECLI:EU:C:1998:555
ref. from Verwaltungsgericht Köln, Germany, 2 June 1997
* *A Turkish national is entitled to respond to any offer of employment in the host Member State after having completed a course of vocational training there, and consequently to be issued with a residence permit, when one of his parents has in the past been legally employed in that State for at least three years.*
However, it is not required that the parent in question should still work or be resident in the Member State in question at the time when his child wishes to gain access to the employment market there.

☞ CJEU C-337/07 — ***Altun v. Germany*** — 18 Dec. 2008
* interpr. of — Dec. 1/80: Art. 7 — ECLI:EU:C:2008:744
ref. from Verwaltungsgericht Stuttgart, Germany, 20 July 2007
* *Art. 7(1) of Dec. 1/80 is to be interpreted as meaning that the child of a Turkish worker may enjoy rights arising by virtue of that provision where, during the three-year period when the child was co-habiting with that worker, the latter was working for two and a half years before being unemployed for the following six months.*
The fact that a Turkish worker has obtained the right of residence in a Member State and, accordingly, the right of access to the labour market of that State as a political refugee does not prevent a member of his family from enjoying the rights arising under the first paragraph of Art. 7 of Dec. 1/80.
Art. 7(1) of Dec. 1/80 is to be interpreted as meaning that when a Turkish worker has obtained the status of political refugee on the basis of false statements, the rights that a member of his family derives from that provision cannot be called into to question if the latter, on the date on which the residence permit issued to that worker is withdrawn, fulfils the conditions laid down therein.

☞ CJEU C-275/02 — ***Ayaz v. Germany*** — 30 Sep. 2004
* interpr. of — Dec. 1/80: Art. 7 — ECLI:EU:C:2004:570
ref. from Verwaltungsgericht Stuttgart, Germany, 26 July 2002
* *A stepson who is under the age of 21 years or is a dependant of a Turkish worker duly registered as belonging to the labour force of a Member State is a member of the family of that worker.*

☞ CJEU C-373/03 — ***Aydinli v. Germany*** — 7 July 2005
* interpr. of — Dec. 1/80: Art. 6+7 — ECLI:EU:C:2005:434
ref. from Verwaltungsgericht Freiburg, Germany, 12 Mar. 2003
* *A long detention is no justification for loss of residence permit.*

☞ CJEU C-462/08 — ***Bekleyen v. Germany*** — 21 Jan. 2010
* interpr. of — Dec. 1/80: Art. 7(2) — ECLI:EU:C:2010:30
ref. from Oberverwaltungsgericht Berlin-Brandenburg, Germany, 27 Oct. 2008
* *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.*

☞ CJEU C-89/00 — ***Bicakci v. Germany*** — 19 Sep. 2000
* interpr. of — Dec. 1/80:
ref. from Verwaltungsgericht Berlin, Germany, 8 Mar. 2000
* *Art 14 does not refer to a preventive expulsion measure.*

☞ CJEU C-1/97 — ***Birden v. Germany*** — 26 Nov. 1998
* interpr. of — Dec. 1/80: Art. 6(1) — ECLI:EU:C:1998:568
ref. from Verwaltungsgericht Bremen, Germany, 6 Jan. 1997
* *In so far as he has available a job with the same employer, a Turkish national in that situation is entitled to demand the renewal of his residence permit in the host MS, even if, pursuant to the legislation of that MS, the activity pursued by him was restricted to a limited group of persons, was intended to facilitate their integration into working life and was financed by public funds.*

☞ CJEU C-171/01 — ***Birlikte v. Austria*** — 8 May 2003
* interpr. of — Dec. 1/80: Art. 10(1) — ECLI:EU:C:2003:260
ref. from Verfassungsgerichtshof, Austria, 19 Apr. 2001
* *Art 10 precludes the application of national legislation which excludes Turkish workers duly registered as belonging to the labour force of the host MS from eligibility for election to organisations such as trade unions.*

☞ CJEU C-467/02 — ***Cetinkaya v. Germany*** — 11 Nov. 2004
* interpr. of — Dec. 1/80: Art. 7+14(1) — ECLI:EU:C:2004:708
ref. from Verwaltungsgericht Stuttgart, Germany, 19 Dec. 2002
* *The meaning of a "family member" is analogous to its meaning in the Free Movement Regulation.*

☞ CJEU C-677/17 — ***Çoban v. NL*** — 15 May 2019
* interpr. of — Dec. 3/80: Art. 6(1) — ECLI:EU:C:2019:408
ref. from Centrale Raad van Beroep, NL, 1 Dec. 2017
* *The first subparagraph of Article 6(1) of Decision 3/80 must be interpreted as not precluding a national provision, such as that at issue in the main proceedings, which withdraws a supplementary benefit from a Turkish national who returns to his country of origin and who holds, at the date of his departure from the host Member State, long-term resident status, within the meaning of Council Directive 2003/109 (on long-term residents).*

☞ CJEU C-92/07 — ***Com. v. NL*** — 29 Apr. 2010
* interpr. of — Dec. 1/80: Art. 10(1)+13 — ECLI:EU:C:2010:228
ref. from Commission, EU, 16 Feb. 2007
* *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.*

☞ CJEU C-465/01 — ***Com. v. Austria*** — 16 Sep. 2004
* interpr. of — Dec. 1/80: Art. 10(1) — ECLI:EU:C:2004:530
ref. from Commission, EU, 4 Dec. 2001
* *Austria has failed to fulfil its obligations by denying workers who are nationals of other MS the right to stand for election for workers' chambers: art. 10(1) prohibition of all discrimination based on nationality.*

☞ CJEU C-225/12 — ***Demir v. NL*** — 7 Nov. 2013
* interpr. of — Dec. 1/80: Art. 13 — ECLI:EU:C:2013:725
ref. from Raad van State, NL, 14 May 2012
* *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'.*

☞ CJEU C-171/13 — ***Demirci a.o. v. NL*** — 14 Jan. 2015
* interpr. of — Dec. 3/80: Art. 6(1) — ECLI:EU:C:2015:8
ref. from Centrale Raad van Beroep, NL, 8 Apr. 2013
* *Art. 6(1) must be interpreted as meaning that nationals of a MS who have been duly registered as belonging to the labour force of that MS as Turkish workers cannot, on the ground that they have retained Turkish nationality, rely on Article 6 of Dec. 3/80 to object to a residence requirement provided for by the legislation of that MS in order to receive a special non-contributory benefit within the meaning of Article 4(2) of Reg. 1408/71 on social security .*

☞ CJEU C-12/86 — ***Demirel v. Germany*** — 30 Sep. 1987
* interpr. of — Dec. 1/80: Art. 7+12 — ECLI:EU:C:1987:400
ref. from Verwaltungsgericht Stuttgart, Germany, 17 Jan. 1986
* *No right to family reunification. Art. 12 EEC-Turkey and Art. 36 of the Additional Protocol, do not constitute rules*

of Community law which are directly applicable in the internal legal order of the Member States.

☞ CJEU C-221/11 — ***Demirkan v. Germany*** — 24 Sep. 2013
* interpr. of — Protocol: Art. 41(1) — ECLI:EU:C:2013:583
ref. from Oberverwaltungsgericht Berlin, Germany, 11 May 2011
* *The freedom to 'provide services' does not encompass the freedom to 'receive' services in other EU Member States.*

☞ CJEU C-256/11 — ***Dereci et al. v. Austria*** — 15 Nov. 2011
* interpr. of — Dec. 1/80: Art. 13 — ECLI:EU:C:2011:734
ref. from Verwaltungsgerichtshof, Austria, 25 May 2011
* *EU law does not preclude a Member State from refusing to allow a third country national to reside on its territory, where that third country national wishes to reside with a member of his family who is a citizen of the Union residing in the Member State of which he has nationality, who has never exercised his right to freedom of movement, provided that such refusal does not lead, for the Union citizen concerned, to the denial of the genuine enjoyment of the substance of the rights conferred by virtue of his status as a citizen of the Union, which is a matter for the referring court to verify.*
Art. 41(1) of the Additional Protocol must be interpreted as meaning that the enactment of new legislation more restrictive that the previous legislation, which, for its part, relaxed earlier legislation concerning the conditions for the exercise of the freedom of establishment of Turkish nationals at the time of the entry into force of that protocol in the Member State concerned must be considered to be a 'new restriction' within the meaning of that provision.

☞ CJEU C-325/05 — ***Derin v. Germany*** — 18 July 2007
* interpr. of — Dec. 1/80: Art. 6, 7 and 14 — ECLI:EU:C:2007:442
ref. from Verwaltungsgericht Darmstadt, Germany, 17 Aug. 2005
* *There are two different reasons for loss of rights: (a) a serious threat (Art 14(1) of Dec 1/80), or (b) if he leaves the territory of the MS concerned for a significant length of time without legitimate reason.*

☞ CJEU C-383/03 — ***Dogan (Ergül) v. Austria*** — 7 July 2005
* interpr. of — Dec. 1/80: Art. 6(1) + (2) — ECLI:EU:C:2005:436
ref. from Verwaltungsgerichtshof, Austria, 4 Sep. 2003
* *Return to labour market: no loss due to imprisonment.*

☞ CJEU C-138/13 — ***Dogan (Naime) v. Germany*** — 10 July 2014
* interpr. of — Protocol: Art. 41(1) — ECLI:EU:C:2014:2066
ref. from Verwaltungsgericht Berlin, Germany, 19 Mar. 2013
* *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.*

☞ CJEU C-136/03 — ***Dörr & Unal v. Austria*** — 2 June 2005
* interpr. of — Dec. 1/80: Art. 6(1)+14(1) — ECLI:EU:C:2005:340
ref. from Verwaltungsgerichtshof, Austria, 18 Mar. 2003
* *The procedural guarantees set out in the Dir. on Free Movement also apply to Turkish workers.*

☞ CJEU C-451/11 — ***Dülger v. Germany*** — 19 July 2012
* interpr. of — Dec. 1/80: Art. 7 — ECLI:EU:C:2015:504
ref. from Verwaltungsgericht Gießen, Germany, 1 Sep. 2011
* *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.*

☞ CJEU C-386/95 — ***Eker v. Germany*** — 29 May 1997
* interpr. of — Dec. 1/80: Art. 6(1) — ECLI:EU:C:1997:257
ref. from Bundesverwaltungsgericht, Germany, 11 Dec. 1995
* *On the meaning of "same employer".*

☞ CJEU C-453/07 — ***Er v. Germany*** — 25 Sep. 2008
* interpr. of — Dec. 1/80: Art. 7 — ECLI:EU:C:2008:524
ref. from Verwaltungsgericht Gießen, Germany, 4 Oct. 2007
* *A Turkish national, who was authorised to enter the territory of a Member State as a child in the context of a family reunion, and who has acquired the right to take up freely any paid employment of his choice under the second indent of Art. 7(1) of Dec. 1/80 does not lose the right of residence in that State, which is the corollary of that right of free access, even though, at the age of 23, he has not been in paid employment since leaving school at the age of 16 and has taken part in government job-support schemes without, however, completing them.*

☞ CJEU C-329/97 — ***Ergat v. Germany*** — 16 Mar. 2000
* interpr. of — Dec. 1/80: Art. 7 — ECLI:EU:C:2000:133
ref. from Bundesverwaltungsgericht, Germany, 22 Sep. 1997
* *No loss of residence right in case of application for renewal residence permit after expiration date.*

☞ CJEU C-355/93 — ***Eroglu v. Germany*** — 5 Oct. 1994
* interpr. of — Dec. 1/80: Art. 6(1) — ECLI:EU:C:1994:369
ref. from Verwaltungsgericht Karlsruhe, Germany, 26 May 1993
* *On the meaning of "same employer". The first indent of Art. 6(1) is to be construed as not giving the right to the renewal of his permit to work for his first employer to a Turkish national who is a university graduate and who*

worked for more than one year for his first employer and for some ten months for another employer, having been issued with a two-year conditional residence authorization and corresponding work permits in order to allow him to deepen his knowledge by pursuing an occupational activity or specialized practical training.

☞ CJEU C-98/96 — ***Ertanir v. Germany*** — 30 Sep. 1997
* interpr. of — Dec. 1/80: Art. 6(1)+6(3) — ECLI:EU:C:1997:446
ref. from Verwaltungsgericht Darmstadt, Germany, 26 Mar. 1996

* *Art. 6(3) of Dec. 1/80 is to be interpreted as meaning that it does not permit Member States to adopt national legislation which excludes at the outset whole categories of Turkish migrant workers, such as specialist chefs, from the rights conferred by the three indents of Art. 6(1).*
A Turkish national who has been lawfully employed in a Member State for an uninterrupted period of more than one year ... is duly registered as belonging to the labour force of that Member State and is legally employed within the meaning of Art. 6(1) of Dec. 1/80.
A Turkish national in that situation may accordingly seek the renewal of his permit to reside in the host Member State notwithstanding the fact that he was advised when the work and residence permits were granted that they were for a maximum of three years and restricted to specific work, in this case as a specialist chef, for a specific employer.
Art. 6(1) of Dec. 1/80 is to be interpreted as requiring account to be taken, for the purpose of calculating the periods of legal employment referred to in that provision, of short periods during which the Turkish worker did not hold a valid residence or work permit in the host Member State and which are not covered by Article 6(2) of that decision, where the competent authorities of the host Member State have not called in question on that ground the legality of the residence of the worker in the country but have, on the contrary, issued him with a new residence or work permit.

☞ CJEU C-91/13 — ***Essent v. NL*** — 11 Sep. 2014
* interpr. of — Dec. 1/80: Art. 13 — ECLI:EU:C:2014:2206
ref. from Raad van State, NL, 25 Feb. 2013

* *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.*

☞ CJEU C-65/98 — ***Eyüp v. Austria*** — 22 June 2000
* interpr. of — Dec. 1/80: Art. 7(1) — ECLI:EU:C:2000:336
ref. from Verwaltungsgerichtshof, Austria, 5 Mar. 1998

* *Art. 7(1) of Dec. 1/80 must be interpreted as covering the situation of a Turkish national who, like the applicant in the main proceedings, was authorised in her capacity as the spouse of a Turkish worker duly registered as belonging to the labour force of the host Member State to join that worker there, in circumstances where that spouse, having divorced before the expiry of the three-year qualification period laid down in the first indent of that provision, still continued in fact to live uninterruptedly with her former spouse until the date on which the two former spouses remarried. Such a Turkish national must therefore be regarded as legally resident in that Member State within the meaning of that provision, so that she may rely directly on her right, after three years, to respond to any offer of employment, and, after five years, to enjoy free access to any paid employment of her choice.*

☞ CJEU C-561/14 — ***Genc (Caner) v. Denmark*** — 12 Apr. 2016
* interpr. of — Protocol: Art. 41(1) — ECLI:EU:C:2016:247
ref. from Ostre Landsret, Denmark, 5 Dec. 2014

* *A national measure, making family reunification between a Turkish worker residing lawfully in the MS concerned and his minor child subject to the condition that the latter have, or have the possibility of establishing, sufficient ties with Denmark to enable him successfully to integrate, when the child concerned and his other parent reside in the State of origin or in another State, and the application for family reunification is made more than two years from the date on which the parent residing in the MS concerned obtained a permanent residence permit or a residence permit with a possibility of permanent residence constitutes a 'new restriction', within the meaning of Art. 13 of Decision 1/80. Such a restriction is not justified.*

☞ CJEU C-14/09 — ***Genc (Hava) v. Germany*** — 4 Feb. 2010
* interpr. of — Dec. 1/80: Art. 6(1) — ECLI:EU:C:2010:57
ref. from Verwaltungsgericht Berlin, Germany, 12 Jan. 2009

* *A Turkish worker, within the meaning of Art. 6(1) of Dec. 1/80, may rely on the right to free movement which he derives from the Assn. Agreement even if the purpose for which he entered the host Member State no longer exists. Where such a worker satisfies the conditions set out in Art. 6(1) of that decision, his right of residence in the host Member State cannot be made subject to additional conditions as to the existence of interests capable of justifying residence or as to the nature of the employment.*

☞ CJEU C-268/11 — ***Gühlbahce v. Germany*** — 8 Nov. 2012
* interpr. of — Dec. 1/80: Art. 6(1)+10 — ECLI:EU:C:2012:695
ref. from Oberverwaltungsgericht Hamburg, Germany, 31 May 2011

* *A MS cannot withdraw the residence permit of a Turkish employee with retroactive effect.*

☞ CJEU C-36/96 — ***Günaydin v. Germany*** — 30 Sep. 1997
* interpr. of — Dec. 1/80: Art. 6(1) — ECLI:EU:C:1997:445
ref. from Bundesverwaltungsgericht, Germany, 12 Feb. 1996

* *A Turkish national who has been lawfully employed in a Member State for an uninterrupted period of more than three years in a genuine and effective economic activity for the same employer and whose employment status is not objectively different to that of other employees employed by the same employer or in the sector concerned and*

exercising identical or comparable duties, is duly registered.

☞ CJEU C-374/03 — ***Gürol v. Germany*** — 7 July 2005
* interpr. of — Dec. 1/80: Art. 9 — ECLI:EU:C:2005:435
ref. from Verwaltungsgericht Sigmarinen, Germany, 31 July 2003
* *Art. 9 of Dec. 1/80 has direct effect in the Member States. The condition of residing with parents in accordance with the first sentence of Art. 9 is met in the case of a Turkish child who, after residing legally with his parents in the host Member State, establishes his main residence in the place in the same Member State in which he follows his university studies, while declaring his parents' home to be his secondary residence only.*
The second sentence of Art. 9 of Dec. No 1/80 has direct effect in the Member States. That provision guarantees Turkish children a non-discriminatory right of access to education grants, such as that provided for under the legislation at issue in the main proceedings, that right being theirs even when they pursue higher education studies in Turkey.

☞ CJEU C-4/05 — ***Güzeli v. Germany*** — 26 Oct. 2006
* interpr. of — Dec. 1/80: Art. 6 — ECLI:EU:C:2006:670
ref. from Verwaltungsgericht Aachen, Germany, 6 Jan. 2005
* *The first indent of Art. 6(1) of Dec. 1/80 must be interpreted as meaning that a Turkish worker can rely on the rights conferred upon him by that provision only where his paid employment with a second employer complies with the conditions laid down by law and regulation in the host Member State governing entry into its territory and employment. It is for the national court to make the requisite findings in order to establish whether that is the case in respect of a Turkish worker who changed employer prior to expiry of the period of three years provided for in the second indent of Art. 6(1) of that decision.*
The second sentence of Art. 6(2) of Dec. No 1/80 must be interpreted as meaning that it is intended to ensure that periods of interruption of legal employment on account of involuntary unemployment and long−term sickness do not affect the rights that the Turkish worker has already acquired owing to preceding periods of employment the length of which is fixed in each of the three indents of Art. 6(1) respectively.

☞ CJEU C-351/95 — ***Kadiman v. Germany*** — 17 Apr. 1997
* interpr. of — Dec. 1/80: Art. 7 — ECLI:EU:C:1997:205
ref. from Verwaltungsgericht München, Germany, 13 Nov. 1995
* *The first indent of Art. 7(1) of Dec. 1/80 is to be interpreted as meaning that the family member concerned is in principle required to reside uninterruptedly for three years in the host Member State. However, account must be taken, for the purpose of calculating the three year period of legal residence within the meaning of that provision, of an involuntary stay of less than six months by the person concerned in his country of origin. The same applies to the period during which the person concerned was not in possession of a valid residence permit, where the competent authorities of the host Member State did not claim on that ground*
that the person concerned was not legally resident within national territory,
but on the contrary issued a new residence permit to him.

☞ CJEU C-7/10 — ***Kahveci & Inan v. NL*** — 29 Mar. 2012
* interpr. of — Dec. 1/80: Art. 7 — ECLI:EU:C:2012:180
ref. from Raad van State, NL, 8 Jan. 2010
* joined case with C-9/10
* *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.*

☞ CJEU C-285/95 — ***Kol v. Germany*** — 5 June 1997
* interpr. of — Dec. 1/80: Art. 6(1) — ECLI:EU:C:1997:280
ref. from Oberverwaltungsgericht Berlin, Germany, 11 Aug. 1995
* *Art. 6(1) of Dec. 1/80 is to be interpreted as meaning that a Turkish worker does not satisfy the condition of having been in legal employment, within the meaning of that provision, in the host Member State, where he has been employed there under a residence permit which was issued to him only as a result of fraudulent conduct in respect of which he has been convicted.*

☞ CJEU C-188/00 — ***Kurz (Yuze) v. Germany*** — 19 Nov. 2002
* interpr. of — Dec. 1/80: Art. 6(1)+7 — ECLI:EU:C:2002:694
ref. from Verwaltungsgericht Karlsruhe, Germany, 22 May 2000
* *Where a Turkish national has worked for an employer for an uninterrupted period of at least four years, he enjoys in the host Member State, in accordance with the third indent of Art. 6(1) of Dec. 1/80, the right of free access to any paid employment of his choice and a corresponding right of residence.*
Where a Turkish national who fulfils the conditions laid down in a provision of Dec. 1/80 and therefore enjoys the rights which it confers has been expelled, Community law precludes application of national legislation under which issue of a residence authorisation must be refused until a time-limit has been placed on the effects of the expulsion order.

☞ CJEU C-237/91 — ***Kus v. Germany*** — 16 Dec. 1992
* interpr. of — Dec. 1/80: Art. 6(1)+6(3) — ECLI:EU:C:1992:527
ref. from Hessischer Verwaltungsgerichtshof, Germany, 18 Sep. 1991
* *The third indent of Art. 6(1) of Dec. 1/80 must be interpreted as meaning that a Turkish worker does not fulfil the requirement, laid down in that provision, of having been engaged in legal employment for at least four years, where he was employed on the basis of a right of residence conferred on him only by the operation of national legislation permitting residence in the host country pending completion of the procedure for the grant of a residence permit,*

even though his right of residence has been upheld by a judgment of a court at first instance against which an appeal is pending.
The first indent of Art. 6(1) of Dec. 1/80 must be interpreted as meaning that a Turkish national who obtained a permit to reside on the territory of a Member State in order to marry there a national of that Member State and has worked there for more than one year with the same employer under a valid work permit is entitled under that provision to renewal of his work permit even if at the time when his application is determined his marriage has been dissolved.

☞ CJEU C-303/08 — ***Metin Bozkurt v. Germany*** — 22 Dec. 2010
* interpr. of — Dec. 1/80: Art. 7+14(1) — ECLI:EU:C:2010:800
ref. from Bundesverwaltungsgericht, Germany, 8 July 2008

* *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.

☞ CJEU C-340/97 — ***Nazli v. Germany*** — 10 Feb. 2000
* interpr. of — Dec. 1/80: Art. 6(1)+14(1) — ECLI:EU:C:2000:77
ref. from Verwaltungsgericht Ansbach, Germany, 1 Oct. 1997

* *A Turkish national who has been in legal employment in a Member State for an uninterrupted period of more than four years but is subsequently detained pending trial for more than a year in connection with an offence for which he is ultimately sentenced to a term of imprisonment suspended in full has not ceased, because he was not in employment while detained pending trial, to be duly registered as belonging to the labour force of the host Member State if he finds a job again within a reasonable period after his release, and may claim there an extension of his residence permit for the purposes of continuing to exercise his right of free access to any paid employment of his choice under the third indent of Art. 6(1) of Dec. 1/80.*
Art. 14(1) of Dec. 1/80 is to be interpreted as precluding the expulsion of a Turkish national who enjoys a right granted directly by that decision when it is ordered, following a criminal conviction, as a deterrent to other aliens without the personal conduct of the person concerned giving reason to consider that he will commit other serious offences prejudicial to the requirements of public policy in the host Member State.

☞ CJEU C-294/06 — ***Payir v. United Kingdom*** — 24 Jan. 2008
* interpr. of — Dec. 1/80: Art. 6(1) — ECLI:EU:C:2008:36
ref. from Court of Appeal, United Kingdom, 30 June 2006

* *The fact that a Turkish national was granted leave to enter the territory of a Member State as an au pair or as a student cannot deprive him of the status of 'worker' and prevent him from being regarded as 'duly registered as belonging to the labour force' of that Member State within the meaning of Art. 6(1) of Dec. 1/80. Accordingly, that fact cannot prevent that national from being able to rely on that provision for the purposes of obtaining renewed permission to work and a corollary right of residence.*

☞ CJEU C-484/07 — ***Pehlivan v. NL*** — 16 June 2011
* interpr. of — Dec. 1/80: Art. 7 — ECLI:EU:C:2011:395
ref. from Rechtbank Den Haag, NL, 31 Oct. 2007

* *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.*

☞ CJEU C-349/06 — ***Polat v. Germany*** — 4 Oct. 2007
* interpr. of — Dec. 1/80: Art. 7+14 — ECLI:EU:C:2007:581
ref. from Verwaltungsgericht Darmstadt, Germany, 21 Aug. 2006

* *Multiple convictions for small crimes do not lead to expulsion. Art. 14(1) of Dec. 1/80 must be interpreted as not precluding the taking of an expulsion measure against a Turkish national who has been the subject of several criminal convictions, provided that his behaviour constitutes a genuine and sufficiently serious threat to a fundamental interest of society.*

☞ CJEU C-242/06 — ***Sahin v. NL*** — 17 Sep. 2009
* interpr. of — Dec. 1/80: Art. 13 — ECLI:EU:C:2009:554
ref. from Raad van State, NL, 29 May 2006

* *Art. 13 of Dec. 1/80 must be interpreted as precluding the introduction, from the entry into force of that decision in the Member State concerned, of national legislation, such as that at issue in the main proceedings, which makes the granting of a residence permit or an extension of the period of validity thereof conditional on payment of administrative charges, where the amount of those charges payable by Turkish nationals is disproportionate as compared with the amount required from Community nationals.*

☞ CJEU C-37/98 — ***Savas v. UK*** — 11 May 2000
* interpr. of — Protocol: Art. 41(1) — ECLI:EU:C:2000:224
ref. from High Court of England and Wales, UK, 16 Feb. 1998

* *Art. 41(1) of the Additional Protocol prohibits the introduction of new national restrictions on the freedom of establishment and right of residence of Turkish nationals as from the date on which that protocol entered into force in the host Member State. It is for the national court to interpret domestic law for the purposes of determining*

whether the rules applied to the applicant in the main proceedings are less favourable than those which were applicable at the time when the Additional Protocol entered into force.

☞ CJEU C-230/03 — ***Sedef v. Germany*** — 10 Jan. 2006
* interpr. of — Dec. 1/80: Art. 6 — ECLI:EU:C:2006:5
ref. from Bundesverwaltungsgericht, Germany, 26 May 2003
* *Art. 6 of Dec. 1/80 is to be interpreted as meaning that:*
– enjoyment of the rights conferred on a Turkish worker by the third indent of paragraph 1 of that article presupposes in principle that the person concerned has already fulfilled the conditions set out in the second indent of that paragraph;
– a Turkish worker who does not yet enjoy the right of free access to any paid employment of his choice under that third indent must be in legal employment without interruption in the host Member State unless he can rely on a legitimate reason of the type laid down in Art. 6(2) to justify his temporary absence from the labour force.
Art. 6(2) of Dec. 1/80 covers interruptions in periods of legal employment, such as those at issue in the main proceedings, and the relevant national authorities cannot, in this case, dispute the right of the Turkish worker concerned to reside in the host Member State.

☞ CJEU C-192/89 — ***Sevince v. NL*** — 20 Sep. 1990
* interpr. of — Dec. 1/80: Art. 6(1)+13 — ECLI:EU:C:1990:322
ref. from Raad van State, NL, 8 June 1989
* *The term 'legal employment' in Art. 2(1)(b) of Dec. 2/76 and Art. 6(1) of Dec. 1/80,*
does not cover the situation of a Turkish worker authorized to engage in employment for such time as the effect of a decision refusing him a right of residence, against which he has lodged an appeal which has been dismissed, is= suspended.

☞ CJEU C-228/06 — ***Soysal v. Germany*** — 19 Feb. 2009
* interpr. of — Protocol: Art. 41(1) — ECLI:EU:C:2009:101
ref. from Oberverwaltungsgericht Berlin-Brandenburg, Germany, 19 May 2006
* *Art. 41(1) of the Add. Protocol is to be interpreted as meaning that it precludes the introduction, as from the entry into force of that protocol, of a requirement that Turkish nationals such as the appellants in the main proceedings must have a visa to enter the territory of a Member State in order to provide services there on behalf of an undertaking established in Turkey, since, on that date, such a visa was not required.*

☞ CJEU C-652/15 — ***Tekdemir v. Germany*** — 29 Mar. 2017
* interpr. of — Dec. 1/80: Art. 13 — ECLI:EU:C:2017:239
ref. from Verwaltungsgericht Darmstadt, Germany, 7 Dec. 2015
* *Art. 13 must be interpreted as meaning that the objective of efficient management of migration flows may constitute an overriding reason in the public interest capable of justifying a national measure, introduced after the entry into force of that decision in the Member State in question, requiring nationals of third countries under the age of 16 years old to hold a residence permit in order to enter and reside in that Member State. Such a measure is not, however, proportionate to the objective pursued where the procedure for its implementation as regards child nationals of third countries born in the MS in question and one of whose parents is a Turkish worker lawfully residing in that MS, such as the applicant in the main proceedings, goes beyond what is necessary for attaining that objective.*

☞ CJEU C-171/95 — ***Tetik v. Germany*** — 23 Jan. 1997
* interpr. of — Dec. 1/80: Art. 6(1) — ECLI:EU:C:1997:31
ref. from Bundesverwaltungsgericht, Germany, 7 June 1995
* *Art. 6(1) of Dec. 1/80 must be interpreted as meaning that a Turkish worker who has been legally employed for more than four years in a Member State, who decides voluntarily to leave his employment in order to seek new work in the same Member State and is unable immediately to enter into a new employment relationship, enjoys in that State, for a reasonable period, a right of residence for the purpose of seeking new paid employment there, provided that he continues to be duly registered as belonging to the labour force of the Member State concerned, complying where appropriate with the requirements of the legislation in force in that State, for instance by registering as a person seeking employment and making himself available to the employment authorities. It is for the Member State concerned and, in the absence of legislation to that end, for the national court before which the matter has been brought to fix such a reasonable period, which must, however, be sufficient not to jeopardize in fact the prospects of his finding new employment.*

☞ CJEU C-300/09 — ***Toprak & Oguz v. NL*** — 9 Dec. 2010
* interpr. of — Dec. 1/80: Art. 13 — ECLI:EU:C:2010:756
ref. from Raad van State, NL, 30 July 2009
* joined case with C-301/09
* *Art. 13 of Dec. 1/80 must be interpreted as meaning that a tightening of a provision introduced after 1 December 1980, which provided for a relaxation of the provision applicable on 1 December 1980, constitutes a 'new restriction' within the meaning of that article, even where that tightening does not make the conditions governing the acquisition of that permit more stringent than those which resulted from the provision in force on 1 December 1980.*

☞ CJEU C-502/04 — ***Torun v. Germany*** — 16 Feb. 2006
* interpr. of — Dec. 1/80: Art. 7 — ECLI:EU:C:2006:112
ref. from Bundesverwaltungsgericht, Germany, 7 Dec. 2004
* *The child, who has reached the age of majority, of a Turkish migrant worker who has been legally employed in a Member State for more than three years, and who has successfully finished a vocational training course in that*

State and satisfies the conditions set out in Art. 7(2) of Dec. 1/80, does not lose the right of residence that is the corollary of the right to respond to any offer of employment conferred by that provision except in the circumstances laid down in Art. 14(1) of that provision or when he leaves the territory of the host Member State for a significant length of time without legitimate reason.

☞ CJEU C-16/05 — ***Tum & Dari v. UK*** — 20 Sep. 2007
* interpr. of — Protocol: Art. 41(1) — ECLI:EU:C:2007:530
ref. from House of Lords, UK, 19 Jan. 2005
* *Art. 41(1) of the Add. Protocol is to be interpreted as prohibiting the introduction, as from the entry into force of that protocol with regard to the Member State concerned, of any new restrictions on the exercise of freedom of establishment, including those relating to the substantive and/or procedural conditions governing the first admission into the territory of that State, of Turkish nationals intending to establish themselves in business there on their own account.*

☞ CJEU C-186/10 — ***Tural Oguz v. UK*** — 21 July 2011
* interpr. of — Protocol: Art. 41(1) — ECLI:EU:C:2011:509
ref. from Court of Appeal (E&W), UK, 15 Apr. 2010
* *Art. 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.*

☞ CJEU C-508/15 — ***Ucar a.o. v. Germany*** — 21 Dec. 2016
* interpr. of — Dec. 1/80: Art. 7 — ECLI:EU:C:2016:986
ref. from Verwaltungsgericht Berlin, Germany, 24 Sep. 2015
* *Art 7 must be interpreted as meaning that that provision confers a right of residence in the host MS on a family member of a Turkish worker, who has been authorised to enter that MS, for the purposes of family reunification, and who, from his entry into the territory of that MS, has lived with that Turkish worker, even if the period of at least three years during which the latter is duly registered as belonging to the labour force does not immediately follow the arrival of the family member concerned in the host MS, but is subsequent to it.*

☞ CJEU C-187/10 — ***Unal v. NL*** — 29 Sep. 2011
* interpr. of — Dec. 1/80: Art. 6(1) — ECLI:EU:C:2011:623
ref. from Raad van State, NL, 16 Apr. 2010
* *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.*

☞ CJEU C-123/17 — ***Yön v. Germany*** — 7 Aug. 2018
* interpr. of — Dec. 1/80: Art. 13 — ECLI:EU:C:2018:632
ref. from Bundesverwaltungsgericht Leipzig, Germany, 10 Mar. 2017
* *Meaning of the standstill clause of Art 13 Dec 1/80 and Art 7 Dec 2/76 in relation to the language requirement of visa for retiring spouses. A national measure, taken during the period from 20 december 1976 to 30 November 1980, which makes the grant, for the purposes of family reunification, of a residence permit to third-country nationals who are family members of a Turkish worker residing lawfully in the Member State concerned, subject to such nationals obtaining, before entering national territory, a visa for the purpose of that reunification, constitutes a 'new restriction' within the meaning of that provision.*
Such a measure may nevertheless be justified on the grounds of the effective control of immigration and the management of migratory flows, but may be accepted only provided that the detailed rules relating to its implementation do not go beyond what is necessary to achieve the objective pursued, which it is for the national court to verify.

☞ CJEU C-371/08 — ***Ziebell or Örnek v. Germany*** — 8 Dec. 2011
* interpr. of — Dec. 1/80: Art. 14(1) — ECLI:EU:C:2011:809
ref. from Verwaltungsgerichtshof Baden Württemberg, Germany, 14 Aug. 2008
* *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

☞ CJEU C-70/18 — ***A.B. & P. v. NL***
* interpr. of — Dec. 1/80: Art. 13 — ECLI:EU:C:2019:361
ref. from Raad van State, NL, 2 Feb. 2018
* AG: 2 May 2019
* *On the use (processing and storage) of biometric data in databases and access to these databases for criminal law purposes, and the meaning of that in the context of the standstill Articles.*

☞ CJEU C-257/18 ***Güler & Solak v. NL***
* interpr. of Dec. 3/80: Art. 6
ref. from Centrale Raad van Beroep, NL, 13 Apr. 2018
* joined case with C-258/18
* *On the effect of the loss of (Union) citizenship.*

4.4.3 CJEU Judgments on Readmission Treaties

☞ CJEU T-192/16 ***N.F. v. European Council*** 27 Feb. 2017
* validity of EU-Turkey Statement: inadm. ECLI:EU:C:2017:128
* *Applicant claims that the EU-Turkey Statement constitutes an agreement that produces legal effects adversely affecting applicants rights and interests as they risk refoulement to Turkey and subsequently to Pakistan. The action is dismissed on the ground of the Court's lack of jurisdiction to hear and determine it.*
Two other identical cases T-193/16 (N.G.) and T-257/16 (N.M.) were also declared inadmissable.