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Welcome to the Second issue of NEMIS in 2020.

We would like to draw your attention to the following

Family life
The ECtHR ruled in Sudita v. Hungary (42321/15) that Hungary had not complied with its positive obligation to provide an effective and accessible procedure or a combination of procedures enabling a stateless person to have his status in Hungary determined with due regard to his private-life interests under Article 8. It took 15 years and legal action from the Hungarian Constitutional Court, before the applicant was granted the stateless status in 2017.

Withdrawal of status
The Spanish Court Tribunal Superior de Justicia de Castilla-La Mancha has requested in several cases (C-531, 533, 534, 549, 567/19) more or less the same preliminary question: is the interpretation of the Spanish Supreme Court, set out in several judgments, of Dir. 2001/40 (on the mutual recognition of expulsions decisions) correct that any TCN holding a long-term residence permit who has committed an offence punishable by a sentence of at least one year in duration can and should be ‘automatically’ removed, that is to say, without needing to give any consideration to his personal, family, social or employment circumstances, compatible with Art. 12 LTR directive. Interestingly, the CJEU has already answered this question in 2017 in Lopez Pustizano (C-636/16) stating that the Spanish Supreme Court is wrong. Now, again, the CJEU ruled in W.T. (C-448/19) that directive 2001/40 does not govern the conditions for the adoption, by a MS, of a decision ordering expulsion in respect of a third-country national who is a long-term resident and who is on its own territory.

Non-discrimination
The Austrian Landesgericht in Linz has requested a preliminary ruling on the Upper Austrian Law on Housing Subsidies which which allows EU citizens, EEA nationals and family members within the meaning of Dir. 2004/38 to receive a social benefit in the form of housing assistance without proof of language proficiency, while requiring TCN with long-term resident status within the meaning of Dir. 2003/109 to provide particular proof of a basic command of German.

Exemption Visa Obligations
In Blue Air (C-584/18) the CJEU has ruled that Art. 13 of the Schengen Borders Code, must be interpreted as precluding an air carrier from relying on the refusal of the authorities of the MS of destination to grant a TCN access to that State, refuse to allow him to board without this refusal of entry being laid down in a reasoned written decision notified in advance to that third-country national. And when that passenger disputes the denied boarding, it is for the competent judicial authority to assess, taking into account the circumstances of the case, whether that refusal is based on reasonable grounds under that provision.

Return and best interests of the child
The Belgian Council of State has requested in M.A. (C-112/20) whether Art. 5 of the Return Dir. (2008/115) which requires Member States, when implementing the directive, to take account of the best interests of the child, together with Art. 13 of that directive and Artt. 24 and 47 of the Charter, be interpreted as requiring the best interests of the child, an EU citizen, to be taken into account even if the return decision is taken with regard to the child’s parent alone.
1 Regular Migration

1.1 Regular Migration: Adopted Measures

case law sorted in chronological order

**Directive 2009/50**

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**

On the right to Family Reunification

* OJ 2003 L 251/12

impl. date 3 Oct. 2005


**CJEU judgments**

- CJEU 12 Dec. 2019, C-381/18: G.S. Art. 6(1)+(2)
- CJEU 12 Dec. 2019, C-519/18: T.B. Art. 10(2)
- CJEU 20 Nov. 2019, C-706/18: X. Art. 3(5)+5(4)
- CJEU 14 Mar. 2019, C-557/17: Y.Z. a.o. Art. 16(2)(a)
- CJEU 13 Mar. 2019, C-635/17: E. Art. 3(2)(c)+11(2)
- CJEU 7 Nov. 2018, C-257/17: C. & A. Art. 3(3)
- CJEU 7 Nov. 2018, C-484/17: K. & B. Art. 9(2)
- CJEU 12 Apr. 2018, C-550/16: A. & S. Art. 2(f)
- CJEU 13 Mar. 2018, C-558/14: Khachab Art. 7(1)(c)+2(d)
- CJEU 8 May 2018, C-380/17: Ymeraga Art. 7(2)
- CJEU 6 Dec. 2012, C-356/11: O. & S. Art. 7(1)(c)
- CJEU 10 June 2011, C-155/11: Imran Art. 7(2) - no adj.
- CJEU 4 Mar. 2010, C-578/08: Chakroun Art. 7(1)(c)+2(d)
- CJEU 21 Apr. 2009, C-384/08: Dan Art. 5(1)(a)

**CJEU pending cases**

- CJEU AG 19 Mar. 2020, C-133/19: P. & S. Art. 4+18

**EFTA judgments**

- EFTA 26 July 2011, E-4/11: Clauser Art. 7(1)

**Council Decision 2007/435**

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

* OJ 2007 L 168/18

UK, IRL opt in

**Directive 2014/66**

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**

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 11 June 2020, C-448/19: W.T. Art. 12
- CJEU 2 Sep. 2015, C-309/14: CGIL
- CJEU 4 June 2015, C-579/13: P. & S. Art. 5+11
- CJEU 5 Nov. 2014, C-311/13: Tümer
### 1.1: Regular Migration: Adopted Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emissary</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Case Ref.</th>
<th>Art.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CJEU</td>
<td>17 July 2014</td>
<td>C-469/13</td>
<td>Tahir (7(1)+13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CJEU</td>
<td>8 Nov. 2012</td>
<td>C-40/11</td>
<td>Iida (7(1))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CJEU</td>
<td>18 Oct. 2012</td>
<td>C-302/10</td>
<td>Singh (3(2)(e))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CJEU</td>
<td>26 Apr. 2012</td>
<td>C-308/10</td>
<td>Com. v. NL (Art. 7(1))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CJEU</td>
<td>24 Apr. 2012</td>
<td>C-571/10</td>
<td>Servet Kamberaj (Art. 11(1)(d))</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CJEU pending cases**

- **New**
  - CJEU C-303/20: Land Oberösterreich (Art. 11)
  - CJEU AG 11 June 2020, C-94/20: V.R. (Art. 11(1)(d))

### Directive 2011/51

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

- OJ 2011 L 132/1 impl. date 20 May 2013
- Extending Dir. 2003/109 on LTR

**CJEU pending cases**

- CJEU C-761/19: Com. v. Hungary (Art. 11(1)(a))
- CJEU C-503/19: U.Q. (Art. 12)

### Council Decision 2006/688

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

- OJ 2006 L 283/40 UK, IRL opt in

### Directive 2005/71

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

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

### Recommendation 762/2005

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

- OJ 2005 L 289/26

### Directive 2016/801

*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 impl. date 24 May 2018
- This directive replaces both Dir 2005/71 on Researchers and Dir 2004/114 on Students

### Regulation 1030/2002

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

- OJ 2002 L 157/1 impl. date 15 June 2002
- Amended by Reg. 330/2008 (OJ 2008 L 115/1)
- Amended by Reg. 1954/2017 (OJ 2017 L 286/9)

### Directive 2014/36

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


### Directive 2011/98

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


**CJEU judgments**

- CJEU 21 June 2017, C-449/16: Martinez Silva (Art. 12(1)(c))
- CJEU AG 11 June 2020, C-302/19: W.S. (Art. 12(1)(c))

### Regulation 859/2003

*Third-Country Nationals’ Social Security extending Reg. 1408/71 and Reg. 374/72*

- OJ 2003 L 124/1 UK, IRL opt in
- Replaced by Reg 1231/2010: Social Security TCN II

**CJEU judgments**

- CJEU 18 Nov. 2010, C-247/09: Xhymshiti (Art. 1)

### Regulation 1231/2010

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

- OJ 2010 L 344/1 impl. date 1 Jan. 2011 IRL opt in
- Replacing Reg. 859/2003 on Social Security TCN
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**Directive 2004/114**

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

- * OJ 2004 L 375/12
  - impl. date 12 Jan. 2007
- * Directive is replaced by Dir. 2016/801 Researchers and Students

**ECtHR Judgments**

- CJEU 24 Jan. 2019, C-477/17 Balandin
  - Art. 1
See further: § 1.3

**New**

- ECtHR 12 May 2020, 42321/15 Sudita
  - Art. 8
- ECtHR 14 May 2019, 23270/16 Abokar
  - Art. 8
- ECtHR 9 Apr. 2019, 23887/16 I.M.
  - Art. 8
- ECtHR 18 Dec. 2018, 76550/13 Saber a.o.
  - Art. 8
- ECtHR 20 Nov. 2018, 42517/15 Yurdaer
  - Art. 8
- ECtHR 23 Oct. 2018, 25593/14 Assem Hassan
  - Art. 8
- ECtHR 23 Oct. 2018, 7841/14 Levakovic
  - Art. 8
- ECtHR 12 June 2018, 23038/15 Gaspar
  - Art. 8
- ECtHR 12 June 2018, 47781/10 Zezev
  - Art. 8
- ECtHR 15 May 2018, 32248/12 Ibroimov
  - Art. 8+14
- ECtHR 26 Apr. 2018, 63311/14 Hoti
  - Art. 8
- ECtHR 14 Sep. 2017, 41215/14 Ndidi
  - Art. 8
- ECtHR 29 June 2017, 33809/15 Alam
  - Art. 8
- ECtHR 25 Apr. 2017, 41697/12 Krasniqi
  - Art. 8
- ECtHR 12 Jan. 2017, 31183/13 Abuhmaid
  - Art. 8+13
- ECtHR 1 Dec. 2016, 77063/11 Salem
  - Art. 8
- ECtHR 8 Nov. 2016, 56971/10 El Ghatet
  - Art. 8
- ECtHR 8 Nov. 2016, 7994/14 Ustinova
  - Art. 8
- ECtHR 21 Sep. 2016, 38030/12 (GC) Khan
  - Art. 8
- ECtHR 21 June 2016, 76136/12 Ramadan
  - Art. 8
- ECtHR 24 May 2016, 38590/10 (GC) Biao
  - Art. 8+14
- ECtHR 3 Oct. 2014, 12738/10 Jeunesse
  - Art. 8
- ECtHR 24 July 2014, 32504/11 Kaplan a.o.
  - Art. 8
- ECtHR 10 July 2014, 52701/09 Mugenzi
  - Art. 8
- ECtHR 8 Apr. 2014, 17120/09 Dhabhi
  - Art. 6+8+14
- ECtHR 11 June 2013, 52166/09 Hasanbasic
  - Art. 8
- ECtHR 16 Apr. 2013, 12020/09 Udèh
  - Art. 8
- ECtHR 13 Dec. 2012, 22689/07 De Ribeiro
  - Art. 8+13
- ECtHR 4 Dec. 2012, 47017/09 Butt
  - Art. 8
- ECtHR 6 Nov. 2012, 22341/09 Hode Abdí
  - Art. 8+14
- ECtHR 14 Feb. 2012, 26940/10 Antwi
  - Art. 8
- ECtHR 10 Jan. 2012, 22251/07 G.R.
  - Art. 8+13
- ECtHR 20 Sep. 2011, 8000/08 A.A.
  - Art. 8
- ECtHR 28 June 2011, 55597/09 Nunez
  - Art. 8
- ECtHR 14 June 2011, 38058/09 Osman
  - Art. 8
- ECtHR 14 Dec. 2010, 34848/07 O’Donoghue
  - Art. 12+14
- ECtHR 6 July 2010, 41615/07 Neulinger
  - Art. 8
- ECtHR 22 Mar. 2007, 1638/03 Maslov
  - Art. 8
- ECtHR 18 Oct. 2006, 46410/99 Üner
  - Art. 8
- ECtHR 2 Aug. 2001, 54273/00 Boultif
  - Art. 8

**ECTHR**

- Art. 8 Family Life
- Art. 12 Right to Marry
- Art. 14 Prohibition of Discrimination
- ETS 005
  - impl. date 31 Aug. 1954

**Family - Marriage - Discrimination**

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

**CJEU**

- CJEU 4 Apr. 2017, C-544/15 Fahimian
  - Art. 6(1)(d)
- CJEU 10 Sep. 2014, C-491/13 Ben Alaya
  - Art. 6+7
- CJEU 21 June 2012, C-15/11 Sommer
  - Art. 17(3)
- CJEU 24 Nov. 2008, C-294/06 Payir
  - See further: § 1.3

See further: § 1.3
### 1.1: Regular Migration: Adopted Measures

See further: § 1.3

**CRC**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UN Convention on the Rights of the Child</th>
<th>Rights of the Child</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Art. 10 Family Life</td>
<td>Art. 3 Best interests of the child</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* 1577 UNTS 27531</td>
<td>impl. date 2 Sep. 1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Optional Communications Protocol that allows for individual complaints entered into force 14-4-2014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CRC views**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRC 27 Sep. 2018, C/79/DR/12/2017</th>
<th>C.E.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Art. 3+10+12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See further: § 1.3

### 1.2 Regular Migration: Proposed Measures

**Directive**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Blue Card II</th>
<th>On the conditions of entry and residence of third-country nationals for the purposes of highly skilled employment.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### 1.3 Regular Migration: Jurisprudence

**case law sorted in alphabetical order**

#### 1.3.1 CJEU Judgments on Regular Migration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AG 26 Oct. 2017</td>
<td></td>
<td>ECLI:EU:C:2017:824</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* interpr. of Dir. 2003/86</td>
<td>Family Reunification Art. 2(f)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* 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.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CJEU 10 Sep. 2014, C-491/13</th>
<th>Ben Alaya</th>
<th>ECLI:EU:C:2014:2187</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AG 12 June 2014</td>
<td></td>
<td>ECLI:EU:C:2014:1933</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* interpr. of Dir. 2004/114</td>
<td>Students Art. 6+7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ref. from Verwaltungsgericht Berlin, Germany, 13 Sep. 2013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* 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.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CJEU 7 Nov. 2018, C-257/17</th>
<th>C. &amp; A.</th>
<th>ECLI:EU:C:2018:876</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AG 27 June 2018</td>
<td></td>
<td>ECLI:EU:C:2018:503</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* interpr. of Dir. 2003/86</td>
<td>Family Reunification Art. 3(3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ref. from Raad van State, NL, 15 May 2017</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* 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.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CJEU 24 Jan. 2019, C-477/17</th>
<th>Balandin</th>
<th>ECLI:EU:C:2019:60</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AG 27 Sep. 2018</td>
<td></td>
<td>ECLI:EU:C:2018:783</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* interpr. of Reg. 1231/2010</td>
<td>Social Security TCN II Art. 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ref. from Centrale Raad van Beroep, NL, 4 Aug. 2017</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* 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.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CJEU 2 Sep. 2015, C-309/14</th>
<th>CGIL</th>
<th>ECLI:EU:C:2015:523</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>* interpr. of Dir. 2003/109</td>
<td>Long-Term Residents</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ref. from Tribunale Amministrativo Regionale per il Lazio, Italy, 30 June 2014</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Italian national legislation has set a minimum fee for a residence permit, which is around eight times the charge for the...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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 4 Mar. 2010, C-578/08**
AG 10 Dec. 2009
* interp. of Dir. 2003/86 Family Reunification Art. 7(1)(c)+2(d)
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 26 Apr. 2012, C-508/10**
* interp. appl. of Dir. 2003/109 Long-Term Residents
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 10 July 2014, C-138/13**
AG 30 Apr. 2014
* interp. of Dir. 2003/86 Family Reunification Art. 7(2)
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 the 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, § 4.3).

**CJEU 13 Mar. 2019, C-635/17**
AG 29 Nov. 2018
* interp. of Dir. 2003/86 Family Reunification Art. 3(2)(e)+11(2)
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 27 June 2006, C-540/03**
AG 8 Sep. 2005
* interp. of Dir. 2003/86 Family Reunification Art. 8
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 4 Apr. 2017, C-544/15**
AG 29 Nov. 2016
* interp. of Dir. 2004/114 Students Art. 6(1)(d)
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.

**F**

**CJEU 12 Dec. 2019, C-381/18**

G.S.

AG 11 July 2019

* interpr. of Dir. 2003/86

Family Reunification Art. 6(1)+(2)

ref. from Raad van State, NL, 11 June 2018

* Joined case with C-382/18. Art. 6(1)+(2) must be interpreted as not precluding a national practice under which the competent authorities may, on grounds of public policy: (1) reject an application, founded on that directive, for entry and residence, on the basis of a criminal conviction imposed during a previous stay on the territory of the Member State concerned, and (2) withdraw a residence permit founded on that directive or refuse to renew it where a sentence sufficiently severe in comparison with the duration of the stay has been imposed on the applicant, provided that that practice is applicable only if the offence which warranted the criminal conviction at issue is sufficiently serious to establish that it is necessary to rule out residence of that applicant and that those authorities carry out the individual assessment provided for in Art. 17.

**F**

**CJEU 8 Nov. 2012, C-40/11**

Ida

AG 15 May 2012

* interpr. of Dir. 2003/109

Long-Term Residents Art. 7(1)

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.

**F**

**CJEU 10 June 2011, C-155/11**

Imran

AG 10 May 2012

* interpr. of Dir. 2003/86

Family Reunification Art. 7(2) - no adj.

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.

**F**

**CJEU 7 Nov. 2018, C-484/17**

K.

AG 19 Mar. 2015

* interpr. of Dir. 2003/86

Family Reunification Art. 15

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.

**F**

**CJEU 9 July 2015, C-153/14**

K. & A.

AG 27 June 2018

* interpr. of Dir. 2003/86

Family Reunification Art. 7(2)

ref. from Raad van State, NL, 26 June 2017

* 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
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- **CJEU 21 Apr. 2016, C-558/14** Khachab
  - **AG 23 Dec. 2015**
  - **ECLI:EU:C:2016:285**
  - **ECLI:EU:C:2015:852**
  - **interpr. of Dir. 2003/86**
  - **Family Reunification Art. 7(1)(c)**
  - **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 7 Dec. 2017, C-636/16** Lopez Pastuzano
  - **AG 15 May 2012**
  - **CJEU 18 Oct. 2012, C-502/10**
  - **CJEU 24 Apr. 2012, C-571/10**
  - **ECLI:EU:C:2017:949**
  - **interpr. of Dir. 2003/109**
  - **Long-Term Residents Art. 12**
  - **ref. from Juzgado de lo Contencioso-Adm. of Pamplona, Spain, 9 Dec. 2016**
  - **The CJEU states 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 21 June 2017, C-449/16** Martinez Silva
  - **AG 11/98**
  - **ECLI:EU:C:2017:485**
  - **interpr. of Dir. 2011/98**
  - **Single Permit Art. 12(1)(c)**
  - **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 17 July 2014, C-338/13** Noorzia
  - **AG 30 Apr. 2014**
  - **ECLI:EU:C:2014:2092**
  - **ECLI:EU:C:2014:288**
  - **interpr. of Dir. 2003/86**
  - **Family Reunification Art. 4(5)**
  - **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 6 Dec. 2012, C-356/11** O. & S.
  - **AG 27 Sep. 2012**
  - **ECLI:EU:C:2012:776**
  - **ECLI:EU:C:2012:595**
  - **interpr. of Dir. 2003/86**
  - **Family Reunification Art. 7(1)(c)**
  - **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 4 June 2015, C-579/13** P. & S.
  - **AG 28 Jan. 2015**
  - **ECLI:EU:C:2015:369**
  - **ECLI:EU:C:2015:39**
  - **interpr. of Dir. 2003/109**
  - **Long-Term Residents Art. 5+11**
  - **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 24 Nov. 2008, C-294/06** Payir
  - **AG 18 July 2007**
  - **ECLI:EU:C:2008:36**
  - **ECLI:EU:C:2007:455**
  - **interpr. of Dir. 2004/114**
  - **Students**
  - **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 24 Apr. 2012, C-571/10** Servet Kamberaj
  - **AG 13 Dec. 2011**
  - **ECLI:EU:C:2012:233**
  - **ECLI:EU:C:2011:827**
  - **interpr. of Dir. 2003/109**
  - **Long-Term Residents Art. 11(1)(d)**
  - **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 18 Oct. 2012, C-502/10** Singh
  - **AG 15 May 2012**
  - **ECLI:EU:C:2012:636**
  - **ECLI:EU:C:2012:294**
  - **interpr. of Dir. 2003/109**
  - **Long-Term Residents Art. 3(2)(e)**
  - **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.**
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**New**

- **CJEU 17 July 2014, C-469/13** Tahir
  - interp. of Dir. 2003/109
  - Long-Term Residents Art. 7(1)+13
  - 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 5 Nov. 2014, C-311/13** Tümer
  - interp. of Dir. 2003/109
  - Long-Term Residents
  - 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 11 June 2020, C-448/19** W. T.
  - interp. of Dir. 2003/109
  - Long-Term Residents Art. 12
  - ref. from Tribunal Superior de Justicia de Castilla-La Mancha, Spain, 12 June 2019
  - Art. 12 of Dir. 2003/109 must be interpreted as precluding legislation of a MS which, as interpreted by national case-law with reference to Council Directive 2001/40, provides for the expulsion of any third-country national who holds a long-term residence permit who has committed a criminal offence punishable by a custodial sentence of at least one year, without it being necessary to examine whether the third country national represents a genuine and sufficiently serious threat to public order or public security or to take into account the duration of residence in the territory of that Member State, the age of the person concerned, the consequences of expulsion for the person concerned and family members and the links with the country of residence or the absence of links with the country of origin.

- **CJEU 27 Oct. 2016, C-465/14** Wieland & Rothwangl
  - interp. of Reg. 859/2003
  - Social Security TCN I Art. 1
  - 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 3 Oct. 2019, C-302/18** X.
  - interp. of Dir. 2003/109
  - Long-Term Residents Art. 5(1)(a)
  - ref. from Raad voor Vreemdelingenbewistingen, Belgium, 4 May 2018
  - Art. 5(1)(a) of LTR Dir. must be interpreted as meaning that the concept of ‘resources’ referred to in that provision does not concern solely the ‘own resources’ of the applicant for long-term resident status, but may also cover the resources made available to that applicant by a third party provided that, in the light of the individual circumstances of the applicant concerned, they are considered to be stable, regular and sufficient.

- **CJEU 20 Nov. 2019, C-706/18** X.
  - interp. of Dir. 2003/86
  - Family Reunification Art. 3(5)+5(4)
  - ref. from Raad voor Vreemdelingenbewistingen, Belgium, 14 Nov. 2018
  - Art. 2003/86 on family reunification must be interpreted as precluding national legislation under which, in the absence of a decision being adopted within six months of the date on which the application for family reunification was lodged, the competent national authorities must automatically issue a residence permit to the applicant, without necessarily having to establish in advance that the latter actually meets the requirements for residence in the host Member State in accordance with EU law.

---

**CJEU 21 June 2012, C-15/11** Sommer
- interp. of Dir. 2004/114
- 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 12 Dec. 2019, C-519/18** T.B.
  - interp. of Dir. 2003/86
  - Family Reunification Art. 10(2)
  - ref. from Fővárosi Közigazgatási és Munkaügyi Bíróság, Hungary, 7 Aug. 2018
  - Art. 10(2) must be interpreted as not precluding a MS State from authorising the family reunion of a refugee's sister only if she is, on account of her state of health, unable to provide for her own needs, provided that:
    1. that inability is assessed having regard to the special situation of refugees and at the end of a case-by-case examination taking into account all the relevant factors, and
    2. that it may be ascertained, having regard to the special situation of refugees and at the end of a case-by-case examination taking into account all the relevant factors, that the material support of the person concerned is actually provided by the refugee, or that the refugee appears as the family member most able to provide the material support required.

- **CJEU 10 Feb. 2020, C-25/19** Alex Tümer
  - interp. of Reg. 859/2003
  - Social Security TCN I Art. 1
  - ref. from Verwaltungsgerichtshof, Austria, 12 Jan. 2011
  - Art. 5(1)(a) of LTR Dir. must be interpreted as meaning that the concept of ‘resources’ referred to in that provision does not concern solely the ‘own resources’ of the applicant for long-term resident status, but may also cover the resources made available to that applicant by a third party provided that, in the light of the individual circumstances of the applicant concerned, they are considered to be stable, regular and sufficient.

- **CJEU 21 Dec. 2019, C-706/18** T.B.
  - interp. of Dir. 2003/86
  - Family Reunification Art. 10(2)
  - ref. from Fővárosi Közigazgatási és Munkaügyi Bíróság, Hungary, 7 Aug. 2018
  - Art. 10(2) must be interpreted as not precluding a MS State from authorising the family reunion of a refugee's sister only if she is, on account of her state of health, unable to provide for her own needs, provided that:
    1. that inability is assessed having regard to the special situation of refugees and at the end of a case-by-case examination taking into account all the relevant factors, and
    2. that it may be ascertained, having regard to the special situation of refugees and at the end of a case-by-case examination taking into account all the relevant factors, that the material support of the person concerned is actually provided by the refugee, or that the refugee appears as the family member most able to provide the material support required.

---

**CJEU 21 June 2012, C-15/11** Sommer
- interp. of Dir. 2004/114
- 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
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CJEU 18 Nov. 2010, C-247/09 - Xhmishi 
* Interpr. of Reg. 859/2003 Social Security TCN I 
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 14 Mar. 2019, C-557/17 - Z.F. 
* Interpr. of Dir. 2003/86 Family Reunification Art. 16(2)(a) 
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.

* Interpr. of Dir. 2003/109 Long-Term Residents Art. 9(1)(a) 
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-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 8 May 2013, C-375/12 - Ymeraga 
* Interpr. of Dir. 2003/86 Family Reunification Art. 3(3) 
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-258/11 Dereci, par. 58 in our other newsletter NEFIS).

1.3.2 CJEU pending cases on Regular Migration

CJEU C-930/19 - Belgian State 
* Interpr. of Dir. 2003/86 Family Reunification Art. 15(3) 
Ref. from Conseil des contentieux des étrangers, Belgium, 20 Dec. 2019 
* Does Article 13(2) infringe Articles 20 and 21 of the Charter, in that it provides that divorce, annulment of marriage or termination of a registered partnership does not entail loss of the right of residence of a Union citizen’s family members who are not nationals of a MS where, inter alia, this is warranted by particularly difficult circumstances, such as having been a victim of domestic violence while the marriage or registered partnership was subsisting, but only on the condition that the persons concerned show that they are workers or self-employed persons or that they have sufficient resources for themselves and their family members not to become a burden on the social assistance system of the host MS during their period of residence and have comprehensive sickness insurance cover in the host MS, or that they are members of the family, already constituted in the host Member State, of a person satisfying these requirements, whereas Article 15(3), which makes the same provision for the right of residence to continue, does not make its continuation subject to that condition?

CJEU C-250/19 - B.O.L. 
* 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. 
* Interpr. of Dir. 2003/86 Family Reunification Art. 4 
Ref. from Conseil d’Etat, Belgium, 19 Feb. 2019 
* Joined case with C-138/19 and C-137/19. 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-761/19 - Com. v. Hungary 
* Interpr. of Dir. 2011/51 Long-Term Residents ext. Art. 11(1)(a) 
Ref. from European Commission, EU. 
* Whether Hungary has failed to fulfil its obligations under Article 11(1)(a) of Directive 2003/109 by not admitting third-country nationals who are long-term residents as members of the College of Veterinary Surgeons, which prevents those third country nationals ab initio from working as employed veterinarians or exercising that profession on a self-employed
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- **New**
  - CJEU C-94/20
    - Land Oberösterreich
    - ref. from Landesgericht Linz, Austria, 25 Feb. 2020
    - Is the principle of non-discrimination on grounds of ethnic origin in accordance with Art. 21 of the Charter to be interpreted as precluding national legislation such as Par. 6(9) and (11) ooWFG, which allows EU citizens, EEA nationals and family members within the meaning of Directive 2004/38 to receive a social benefit (housing assistance in accordance with the ooWFG) without proof of language proficiency, while requiring third country nationals (including those with long-term resident status within the meaning of Directive 2003/109) to provide particular proof of a basic command of German?

- CJEU C-503/19
  - U.Q.
  - ref from Juzgado de lo Contencioso-Administrativo de Barcelona, Spain, 2 July 2019
  - On the issue whether any criminal record is sufficient to refuse LTR status. Joined case with: C-592/19.

- CJEU C-303/19
  - V.R.
  - AG 11 June 2020
  - 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?

- CJEU C-302/19
  - W.S.
  - AG 11 June 2020
  - 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?

### 1.3.3 EFTA judgments on Regular Migration

- EFTA 26 July 2011, E-4/11
  - Claude
  - ref. from Corte Suprema di cassazione, Italy, 11 Apr. 2019
  - 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 21 Sep. 2016, E-28/15
  - Yankuba Jabbi
  - ref. from Court of Appeal of Liechtenstein, 28 Aug. 2013
  - 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 ECHR Judgments on Regular Migration

- ECHR 20 Sep. 2011, 8000/08
  - A.A. v. UK
  - ECLI:CE:ECHR:2011:0920JUD000800008
  - violation of
  - ECHR:Art. 8
  - The applicant, alleged, in particular, that his deportation to Nigeria would violate his right to respect for his family and private life and would deprive him of the right to education by terminating his university studies in the UK.

- ECHR 14 May 2019, 23270/16
  - Abokar v. SWE
  - ECLI:CE:ECHR:2019:0514JUD002327016
  - no violation of
  - ECHR:Art. 8
  - 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 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.


**1.3: Regular Migration: Jurisprudence: ECtHR Judgments**

- **ECtHR 12 Jan. 2017, 31183/13**  
  **Abuhmaid v. UKR**  
  ECLI:CE:ECHR:2017:0112JUD003118313  
  * no violation of ECHR:Art. 8+13  
  * 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 29 June 2017, 33809/15**  
  **Alam v. DEN**  
  ECLI:CE:ECHR:2017:0629JUD003380915  
  * no violation of ECHR:Art. 8  
  * 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 14 Feb. 2012, 26940/10**  
  **Antwi v. NOR**  
  ECLI:CE:ECHR:2012:0214JUD002694010  
  * no violation of ECHR:Art. 8  
  * 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 25 Oct. 2018, 25593/14**  
  **Assem Hassan v. DEN**  
  ECLI:CE:ECHR:2018:1023JUD002559314  
  * no violation of ECHR:Art. 8  
  * 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 drug 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 24 May 2016, 38590/10 (GC)**  
  **Biao v. DEN**  
  ECLI:CE:ECHR:2016:0524JUD003859010  
  * violation of ECHR:Art. 8+14  
  * 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 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 2 Aug. 2001, 54273/00**  
  **Boultif v. CH**  
  ECLI:CE:ECHR:2001:0802JUD005427300  
  * violation of ECHR:Art. 8  
  * 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 4 Dec. 2012, 47017/09**  
  **Butt v. NOR**  
  ECLI:CE:ECHR:2012:1204JUD004701709  
  * violation of ECHR:Art. 8  
  * 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 and 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 13 Dec. 2012, 22689/07**  
  **De Souza Ribeiro v. UK**  
  ECLI:CE:ECHR:2012:1213JUD002268907  
  * 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 and 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.
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* violation of ECHR: Art. 8+13
* A Brazilian in French Guiana was removed to Brazil within 50 minutes after an appeal had been lodged against his removal order. In this case the Court considers that the haste with which the removal order was executed had the effect of rendering the available remedies ineffective in practice and therefore inaccessible. The brevity of that time lapse excludes any possibility that the court seriously examined the circumstances and legal arguments in favour of or against a violation of Article 8 of the Convention in the event of the removal order being enforced. Thus, while States are afforded some discretion as to the manner in which they conform to their obligations under Article 13 of the Convention, that discretion must not result, as in the present case, in an applicant being denied access in practice to the minimum procedural safeguards needed to protect him against arbitrary expulsion. Concerning the danger of overloading the courts and adversely affecting the proper administration of justice in French Guiana, the Court reiterates that, as with Article 6 of the Convention, Article 13 imposes on the Contracting States the duty to organise their judicial systems in such a way that their courts can meet its requirements.


* violation of ECHR: Art. 6+8+14
* The ECtHR ruled that art. 6(1) also means that a national judge has an obligation to decide on a question which requests for a preliminary ruling on the interpretation of Union law. Either the national judge explicitly argues why such a request is pointless (or already answered) or the national judge requests the CJEU for a preliminary ruling on the issue. In this case the Italian Supreme Court did not answer the question at all.

ECtHR 8 Nov. 2016, 56971/10 El Ghatei v. CH ECLI:CE:ECHR:2016:1108JUD0005697110

* 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.


* violation of ECHR: Art. 8+13
* The applicant did not have effective access to the administrative procedure by which he might, subject to fulfilling the conditions prescribed by domestic law, obtain a residence permit which would allow him to reside lawfully with his family in the Netherlands, due to the disproportion between the administrative charge in issue and the actual income of the applicant’s family. The Court finds that the extremely formalistic attitude of the Minister – which, endorsed by the Regional Court, also deprived the applicant of access to the competent administrative tribunal – unjustifiably hindered the applicant’s use of an otherwise effective domestic remedy. There has therefore been a violation of Article 8 and 13 of the Convention.


* interpr. of ECHR: Art. 8
* 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 further motivated report impacting that the applicant was considered a danger to national security.

ECtHR 11 June 2013, 52166/09 Hasanbasic v. CH ECLI:CE:ECHR:2013:0611JUD005216609

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


* violation of ECHR: Art. 8+14
* Discrimination on the basis of date of marriage has no objective and reasonable justification.


* 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 9 Apr. 2019, 23887/16**

*J.M. v. CH*

ECLI:CE:ECHR:2019:0409JUD002388716

* violation of

*ECtHR Art. 8*

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 90%. In 2015 the applicant appealed against the expulsion order; 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 solidarity 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 15 May 2018, 32248/12**

*Ibrogimov v. RUS*

ECLI:CE:ECHR:2018:0515JUD003224812

* violation of

*ECtHR Art. 8*

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 therefore 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 3 Oct. 2014, 12738/10**

*Jeunesse v. NL*

ECLI:CE:ECHR:2014:1003JUD001273810

* violation of

*ECtHR Art. 8*

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 24 July 2014, 32504/11**

*Kaplan a.o. v. NOR*

ECLI:CE:ECHR:2014:0724JUD003250411

* violation of

*ECtHR Art. 8*

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 21 Sep. 2016, 38030/12 (GC)**

*Khan v. GER*

ECLI:CE:ECHR:2016:0921JUD003803012

* interpr. of

*ECtHR Art. 8*

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 25 Apr. 2017, 41697/12**

*Krasniqi v. AUT*

ECLI:CE:ECHR:2017:0425JUD004169712

* no violation of

*ECtHR Art. 8*

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 many 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 23 Oct. 2018, 7841/14**

*Levakovic v. DEN*

ECLI:CE:ECHR:2018:1023JUD00784114

* no violation of

*ECtHR Art. 8*

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 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 22 Mar. 2007, 1638/03**

*Maslov v. AUT*

ECLI:CE:ECHR:2007:0322JUD000163803

* violation of

*ECtHR Art. 8*

In addition to the criteria set out in Boulitis (54273/00) and Uner (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.

- **ECHR 12 Oct. 2006, 13178/03**
  - Mayeka v. BEL
  - ECLI:CE:ECHR:2006:1012JUD001317803
  - no violation of
  - ECHR:Art. 5+8+13

- 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.

- **ECHR 10 July 2014, 52701/09**
  - Mugenzi v. FRA
  - violation of
  - ECHR:Art. 8

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

- **ECHR 14 Sep. 2017, 41215/14**
  - Ndidi v. UK
  - ECLI:CE:ECHR:2017:0914JUD004121514
  - no violation of
  - ECHR:Art. 8

- 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.

- **ECHR 6 July 2010, 41615/07**
  - Neulinger v. CH
  - ECLI:CE:ECHR:2010:0706JUD004161507
  - violation of
  - ECHR:Art. 8

- 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.

- **ECHR 28 June 2011, 55597/09**
  - Nunez v. NOR
  - ECLI:CE:ECHR:2011:0628JUD005559709
  - violation of
  - ECHR:Art. 8

- Although Ms Nunez was deported from Norway in 1996 with a two-year ban on her re-entry into Norway, she returned to Norway, got married and had two daughters born in 2002 and 2003. It takes until 2005 for the Norwegian authorities to revoke her permits and to decide that Mrs Nunez should be expelled. The Court rules that the authorities had not struck a fair balance between the public interest in ensuring effective immigration control and Ms Nunez’s need to remain in Norway in order to continue to have contact with her children.

- **ECHR 14 Dec. 2010, 34848/07**
  - O’Donoghue v. UK
  - ECLI:CE:ECHR:2010:1214JUD003484807
  - violation of
  - ECHR:Art. 12+14

- 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).

- **ECHR 14 June 2011, 38058/09**
  - Osman v. DEN
  - ECLI:CE:ECHR:2011:0614JUD003805809
  - violation of
  - ECHR:Art. 8

- The Court concluded that the denial of admission of a 17 years old Somali girl to Denmark, where she had lived from the age of seven until the age of fifteen, violated Article 8. For a settled migrant who has lawfully spent all of the major part of his or her childhood and youth in a host country, very serious reasons are required to justify expulsion’. The Danish
Government had argued that the refusal was justified because the applicant had been taken out of the country by her father—her mother’s ‘patriarchal’ in exercise of their rights of parental authority. 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 21 June 2016, 76136/12
Ramadan v. MAL
no violation of
ECR: Art. 8
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 18 Dec. 2018, 76550/13
Sabir a.o. v. ESP
violation of
ECR: Art. 8
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 1 Dec. 2016, 77063/11
Salem v. DEN
no violation of
ECR: Art. 8
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 Lebanon.
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 12 May 2020, 42321/15
Sudita v. HUN
violation of
ECR: Art. 8
The applicant, a stateless person of Somali and Nigerian descent, arrived in Hungary in 2002. His attempts to regularise his status were unsuccessful due to a domestic provision which required “lawful stay in the country” as a precondition for granting stateless status. In 2013, this provision was removed by the Constitutional Court of Hungary. Ultimately, the applicant was granted stateless status in October 2017. The ECtHR ruled that Hungary had not complied with its positive obligation to provide an effective and accessible procedure or a combination of procedures enabling the applicant to have the issue of his status in Hungary determined with due regard to his private-life interests under Article 8.

ECtHR 16 Apr. 2013, 12020/09
Udeh v. CH
violation of
ECR: Art. 8
In 2001 a Nigerian national, was sentenced to four months’ imprisonment for possession of a small quantity of cocaine. In 2003 he married a Swiss national who had just given birth to their twin daughters. By virtue of his marriage, he was granted a residence permit in Switzerland. In 2006 he was sentenced to forty-two months’ imprisonment in Germany for a drug-trafficking offence. The Swiss Office of Migration refused to renew his residence permit, stating that his criminal conviction and his family’s dependence on welfare benefits were grounds for his expulsion. An appeal was dismissed. In 2009 he was informed that he had to leave Switzerland. In 2011 he was made the subject of an order prohibiting him from entering Switzerland until 2020. Although he is divorced in the meantime and custody of the children has been awarded to the mother, he has been given contact rights. The court rules that deportation and exclusion orders would prevent the immigrant with two criminal convictions from seeing his minor children: deportation would constitute a violation of article 8.

ECtHR 18 Oct. 2006, 46410/99
Üner v. NL
violation of
ECR: Art. 8
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 that 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 8 Nov. 2016, 7994/14
Ustinova v. RUS
violation of
ECR: Art. 8
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 therefore 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.
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* 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.

1.3.5 CRC views on Regular Migration

* 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.
2 Borders and Visas

2.1 Borders and Visas: Adopted Measures

Regulation 2016/1624
Creating a Borders and Coast Guard Agency
* OJ 2016 L 251/1
* This Regulation repeals: Reg. 2007/2004 and Reg. 1168/2011 (Frontex I) and Reg. 863/2007 (Rapid Interventions Teams). This Regulation is replaced by Reg. 2019/1896 (Frontex II).

Regulation 562/2006
Establishing a Community Code on the rules governing the movement of persons across borders
* OJ 2006 L 105/1
* This Regulation is replaced by Reg. 2016/399 Borders Code II.

CJEU judgments

CJEU 13 Dec. 2018, C-412/17  Touring a.o  Art. 22+23
CJEU 21 June 2017, C-9/16  A.  Art. 20+21
CJEU 4 May 2017, C-17/16  El Dakkak  Art. 4(1)
CJEU 4 Sep. 2014, C-575/12  Air Baltic  Art. 5
CJEU 17 Jan. 2013, C-23/12  Zakaria  Art. 13(3)
CJEU 19 July 2012, C-278/12 (PPU)  Adil  Art. 13+5(4)(a)
CJEU 14 June 2012, C-606/10  ANAFE  Art. 13+5(4)(a)
CJEU 17 Nov. 2011, C-430/10  Gaydarov  Art. 20+21
CJEU 22 June 2010, C-188/10  Melki & Abdeli  Art. 20+21
CJEU 22 Oct. 2009, C-261/08  Garcia & Cabrera  Art. 5+11+13
See further: § 2.3

Regulation 2016/399
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 Reg. 562/2006 Borders Code I.

CJEU judgments

New  CJEU 4 June 2020, C-554/19  F.U.  Art. 22+23
New  CJEU 30 Apr. 2020, C-584/18  Blue Air  Art. 13+2(j)+15
New  CJEU 5 Feb. 2020, C-341/18  J. a.o.  Art. 11
New  CJEU 12 Dec. 2019, C-380/18  E.P.  Art. 6(1)(c)
New  CJEU 19 Mar. 2019, C-444/17  Arib  Art. 32
See further: § 2.3

Decision 574/2007
Establishing European External Borders Fund
* OJ 2007 L 144
* This Regulation is repealed by Reg. 515/2004 (Borders Fund II)

Regulation 515/2014
Internal Security Fund
* OJ 2014 L 150/143
* This Regulation repeals Decision No 574/2007 (Borders Fund I)

Regulation 2017/2226
EES
2.1: Borders and Visas: Adopted Measures

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
and 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 236/1
Regulation 2018/1240

**Regulation 1052/2013**
EUROSUR
Establishing the European Border Surveillance System (Eurosur)

* OJ 2013 L 295/11
impl. date 26 Nov. 2013
* This Regulation is repealed by Reg. 2019/1896 (Frontex II)

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

**Regulation 2007/2004**
Frontex I
Establishing External Borders Agency

* OJ 2004 L 349/1
* This Regulation is replaced by Reg. 2016/1624 Border and Coast Guard Agency.
In 2019 replaced by Regulation 2019/1896 (Frontex II).

**Regulation 2019/1896.**
Frontex II

* OJ 2019 L 295/1
* COM (2018) 631, 12 Sep 2018
* This Regulation repeals Reg. 1052/2013 (Eurosur) and Reg. 2016/1624 (Border and Coast Guard Agency).

**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
and by Cor. 1931/2006 (OJ 2006 L 029): Corrigendum

**CJEU judgments**
CJEU 21 Mar. 2013, C-254/11 Shomodi
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

**CJEU judgments**
CJEU 16 Apr. 2015, C-446/12 Willems a.o.
Art. 4(3)
CJEU 2 Oct. 2014, C-101/13 U.
CJEU 13 Feb. 2014, C-139/13 Com. v. Belgium
Art. 6
CJEU 17 Oct. 2013, C-291/12 Schwarz
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
2.1: Borders and Visas: Adopted Measures

**Regulation 1053/2013**

Schengen Evaluation

* OJ 2013 L 295/27

**Regulation 1997/2006**

Establishing 2nd generation Schengen Information System

* OJ 2006 L 381/4

Replacing:
- Reg. 378/2004 (OJ 2004 L 64)
- Reg. 2424/2001 (OJ 2001 L 328/4)

Ending validity of:

**Council Decision 2016/268**

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**

On the SIRENE Manual and other implementing measures for SIS II

* OJ 2016 L 203/35

**Regulation 2018/1861**

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

* OJ 2018 L 312/1

Replacing:

**Council Decision 2017/818**

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**

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

* OJ 2014 L 157/23


**Regulation 693/2003**

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

* OJ 2003 L 99/8

**Regulation 694/2003**

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

* OJ 2003 L 99/15

**Decision 896/2006**

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)

### Decision 512/2004  
**Establishing Visa Information System (VIS)**  
* OJ 2004 L 213/5

### Council Decision 2008/633  
**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  
**Establishing an Agency to manage VIS, SIS & Eurodac**  
* OJ 2011 L 286/1

### Regulation 810/2009
**Establishing a Community Code on Visas**  
* OJ 2009 L 243/1  

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

### Regulation 1683/95  
**Uniform format for visas**  
* OJ 1995 L 164/1  

CJEU pending cases
- CJEU C-949/19 Konsul Polskiej all Art.
- CJEU C-225/19 Minister van Buitenlandse Zaken Art. 32(3)
- CJEU C-??/20 Q.A. all Art.

**See further: § 2.3**

### Regulation 539/2001  
**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  


### Regulation 333/2002  
**Uniform format for forms for affixing the visa**  
* OJ 2002 L 53/4  

UK opt in
2.1: Borders and Visas: Adopted Measures

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Art.</th>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Khanh</td>
<td>4 Dec. 2018</td>
<td>43639/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3+13</td>
<td>Shioshvili a.o.</td>
<td>20 Dec. 2016</td>
<td>19356/07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3+13</td>
<td>B.M.</td>
<td>19 Dec. 2013</td>
<td>53608/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3+13</td>
<td>Aden Ahmed</td>
<td>23 July 2013</td>
<td>55352/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Samaras</td>
<td>28 Feb. 2012</td>
<td>11463/09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3+13</td>
<td>Hirsi</td>
<td>21 Feb. 2012</td>
<td>27765/09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See further: § 2.3

**ECtHR** Anti-torture

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Art.</th>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Samaras</td>
<td>21 Feb. 2012</td>
<td>27765/09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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)
  Council and EP could not agree before EP elections

**Regulation amending Regulation 539/2001**

Visa waiver Kosovo

- COM (2016) 277, 4 May 2016
- Discussions within Council

Visa waiver Turkey

- COM (2016) 279, 4 May 2016

**Regulation**

New funding programme for borders and visas

- COM (2018) 473, 12 June 2018
- EP adopted position
  Council and EP could not agree before EP elections

**Regulation**

ETIAS access to law enforcement databases

- COM (2019) 3, 7 Jan 2019
  Council position agreed. no EP position yet

**Regulation**

ETIAS access to immigration databases

- COM (2019) 4, 7 Jan 2019
  Council position agreed. no EP position yet

**Regulation**

Amending Reg. on Visa Information System

- COM (2018) 302, 16 May 2018
  Council and EP could not agree before EP elections

2.3 Borders and Visas: Jurisprudence

case law sorted in alphabetical order

2.3.1 CJEU Judgments on Borders and Visas

A. ECLI:EU:C:2017:483

CJEU 21 June 2017, C-9/16

* interpr. of Reg. 562/2006
  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 19 July 2012, C-278/12 (PPU)  Adil  ECLI:EU:C:2012:508
* interpr. of  Reg. 562/2006  Borders Code I Art. 20+21
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 4 Sep. 2014, C-575/12  Air Baltic  ECLI:EU:C:2014:2155
AG 21 May 2014
* interpr. of  Reg. 562/2006  Borders Code I Art. 5
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 4 Sep. 2014, C-575/12  Air Baltic  ECLI:EU:C:2014:2155
AG 21 May 2014
* interpr. of  Reg. 810/2009  Visa Code Art. 24(1)+34
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 14 June 2012, C-606/10  ANAFE  ECLI:EU:C:2012:348
AG 29 Nov. 2011
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 19 Mar. 2019, C-444/17  Arib  ECLI:EU:C:2019:220
AG 17 Oct. 2018
* interpr. of  Reg. 2016/399  Borders Code II Art. 32
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.

New
*CJEU 30 Apr. 2020, C-584/18  Blue Air  ECLI:EU:C:2020:324
AG 17 Jan. 2019
* interpr. of  Reg. 2016/399  Borders Code II Art. 13+2(j)+15
ref. from Epararchiko Dikastirio Larnakas, Cyprus, 19 Sep. 2018
* Art. 13 should be interpreted as precluding an air carrier (relying on the refusal of the authorities of the MS of destination to grant a TCN access to that State) to refuse boarding without this refusal of entry is laid down in a reasoned written decision of which the third-country national has been notified in advance. Art. 2(j) should be interpreted as meaning that a refusal by an air carrier to board a passenger due to the alleged inadequacy of his travel documents does not automatically deprive the passenger of the protection provided for in that Regulation. Indeed, when that passenger disputes that denied boarding, it is for the competent judicial authority to assess, taking into account the circumstances of the case, whether that refusal is based on reasonable grounds under that provision.

* Art. 15 is to be interpreted as precluding a clause applicable to passengers in the pre-published general terms and conditions for the operation or provision of services of an air carrier that limit or exclude the liability of that air carrier when a passenger is refused access to a flight based on the alleged inadequacy of his travel documents, thereby depriving that passenger of any right to compensation.
**2.3: Borders and Visas: Jurisprudence: CJEU Judgments**

- **CJEU 4 Oct. 2006, C-241/05**
  - Bot
  - AG 27 Apr. 2006
  - * interpr. of Schengen Agreement:Art. 20(1)
  - 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 18 Jan. 2005, C-257/01**
  - Com. v. Council
  - AG 27 Apr. 2004
  - * validity of Visa Applications:
  - 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 13 Feb. 2014, C-139/13**
  - Com. v. Belgium
  - AG 11 July 2019
  - * violation of Reg. 2252/2004
  - ref. from European Commission, EU, 19 Mar. 2013
  - * Failure to implement biometric passports containing digital fingerprints within the prescribed periods.

- **CJEU 16 July 2015, C-88/14**
  - Com. v. EP
  - AG 7 May 2015
  - * validity of Reg. 539/2001
  - ref. from European Commission, EU, 21 Feb. 2014
  - * The Commission had requested an annulment of an amendment of the visa list by Regulation 1289/2013. The Court dismisses the action.

- **CJEU 16 Jan. 2018, C-240/17**
  - E.
  - AG 13 Dec. 2017
  - * interpr. of Schengen Agreement:Art. 25(1)+25(2)
  - 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 12 Dec. 2019, C-380/18**
  - E.P.
  - AG 11 July 2019
  - * interpr. of Reg. 2016/399
  - ref. from Raad van State, NL, 11 June 2018
  - * Art 6(1)(e) must be interpreted as not precluding a national practice under which the competent authorities may issue a return decision to a TCN not subject to a visa requirement, who is present on the territory of the MSs for a short stay, on the basis of the fact that that national is considered to be a threat to public policy because he or she is suspected of having committed a criminal offence, provided that that practice is applicable only if: (1) the offence is sufficiently serious, in the light of its nature and of the punishment which may be imposed, to justify that national’s stay on the territory of the Member States being brought to an immediate end, and (2) those authorities have consistent, objective and specific evidence to support their suspicions, matters which are for the referring court to establish.

- **CJEU 4 May 2017, C-17/16**
  - El Dakkak
  - * interpr. of Reg. 562/2006
  - 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 13 Dec. 2017, C-403/16**
  - El Hassani
  - AG 7 Sep. 2017
  - * interpr. of Reg. 810/2009
  - ref. from Nacelnny 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 5 Sep. 2012, C-355/10**
  - EP v. Council
  - AG 17 Apr. 2012
  - * violation of Reg. 562/2006
  - 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 4 June 2020, C-554/19**

* F.U.  

ECLI:EU:C:2020:439

---

**AG 19 May 2009**

* interpr. of Reg. 562/2006  

Borders Code I Art. 22+23

* Art. 22 and 23 must be interpreted as not opposing national legislation which confers on the police authorities of the MS concerned the power to check the identity of any person in an area of 30 kilometres from the land border of that MS with other Schengen States, with the aim of preventing or stopping illegal entry or stay on the territory of that MS or of preventing certain offences which jeopardise border security, regardless of the behaviour of the person concerned and the existence of special circumstances, provided that this competence appears to be framed by sufficiently detailed details and limitations as to the intensity, frequency and selectivity of the checks carried out, thus ensuring that the practical exercise of the said competence cannot have an effect equivalent to that of border checks, which however, is for the referring court to verify.

**CJEU 22 Oct. 2009, C-261/08**

* Garcia & Cabrera  

ECLI:EU:C:2009:648

---

**AG 19 May 2009**

* interpr. of Reg. 562/2006  

Borders Code I Art. 5+11+13

* ref. from Tribunal Superior de Justicia de Murcia, Spain, 19 June 2008

* joined case with C-348/08

* Articles 6b and 23 must be interpreted as meaning that 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 17 Nov. 2011, C-430/10**

* Gaydarov  

ECLI:EU:C:2011:749

---

**AG 17 Oct. 2019**

* interpr. of Reg. 562/2006  

Borders Code I

* 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 5 Feb. 2020, C-341/18**

* J. a.o.  

ECLI:EU:C:2020:76

---

**AG 17 Oct. 2019**

* interpr. of Reg. 2016/399  

Borders Code II Art. 11

* ref. from Raad van State, NL, 24 May 2018

* AG: 17 Oct. 2019

* Article 11(1) must be interpreted as meaning that, when a seaman who is a TCN signs on with a ship in long-term mooring in a sea port of a State forming part of the Schengen area, for the purpose of working on board, before leaving that port on that ship, an exit stamp must, where provided for by that code, be affixed to that seaman’s travel documents not at the time of his signing on, but when the master of that ship notifies the competent national authorities of the ship’s imminent departure.

**CJEU 19 Dec. 2013, C-84/12**

* Koushakii  

ECLI:EU:C:2013:862

---

**AG 11 Apr. 2013**

* interpr. of Reg. 810/2009  

Visa Code Art. 23(4)+32(1)

* ref. from Verwaltungsgericht Berlin, Germany, 17 Feb. 2012

* Art. 23(4), 32(1) and 33(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 2 Apr. 2009, C-139/08**

* Kaiku  

ECLI:EU:C:2009:230

---

**AG 7 June 2010**

* interpr. of Dec. 896/2006  

Transit Switzerland Art. 1+2

* ref. from Oberlandesgericht Karlsruhe, Germany, 7 Apr. 2008

* 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 22 June 2010, C-188/10**

* Melki & Abdeli  

ECLI:EU:C:2010:363

---

**AG 7 June 2010**

* interpr. of Reg. 562/2006  

Borders Code I Art. 20+21

* 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 17 Oct. 2013, C-291/12**

* Schwarz  

ECLI:EU:C:2013:670
* interpr. of Reg. 2252/2004 Passports Art. 1(2) 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 21 Mar. 2013, C-254/11 **
* Shomodi * 
AG 6 Dec. 2012
* interpr. of Reg. 1931/2006 Local Border traffic Art. 2(a)+3(3) 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 8 Sep. 2015, C-44/14 **
* Spain v. EP & Council *
AG 13 May 2015
* 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 13 Dec. 2018, C-412/17 **
* Touring a.o. *
AG 6 Sep. 2018
* interpr. of Reg. 562/2006 Borders Code Art. 22+23 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 allowing 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 2 Oct. 2014, C-101/13 **
* U. *
AG 30 Apr. 2014
* interpr. of Reg. 2252/2004 Passports 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.

** CJEU 29 July 2019, C-680/17 **
* Vethanayagam *
AG 28 Mar. 2019
* interpr. of Reg. 810/2009 Visa Code Art. 8(4)+32(3) ref. from Reichbank 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 10 Apr. 2012, C-83/12 **
* Vo *
AG 26 Mar. 2012
* interpr. of Reg. 810/2009 Visa Code Art. 21+34 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 16 Apr. 2015, C-446/12 **
* Willems a.o. *
AG 29 Mar. 2012
* interpr. of Reg. 2252/2004 Passports Art. 4(3) 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 7 Mar. 2017, C-638/16 PPU **
* X. & X. *
AG 27 Apr. 2017
* The Commission and the action of Directive 2003/87/EC and Regulation 1205/2013 offer different means to prevent fraud, and the measures taken by a Member States cannot be regarded as an infringement of the obligations placed on its nationals under that legislation if the Member State takes those measures within the scope of that legislation, but in a manner which is not compatible with the requirements of that legislation.
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AG 7 Feb. 2017

* 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 17 Jan. 2013, C-23/12

* 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-275/19
 interpr. of Reg. 810/2009 on referred from Rechtbank Den Haag (z)p Haarlem, NL, 14 Mar. 2019

* Joined case with C-226/19. 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 SchengenBorders 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?

CJEU C-949/19
 interpr. of Reg. 810/2009 on referred from Nazczelny Sąd Administracyjny, Poland, 31 Dec. 2009

* Effective remedy (art 47 Charter) and the refusal of issuing a visa.

CJEU C-949/19
 interpr. of Reg. 810/2009 on referred from Rechtbank Den Haag (z)p Haarlem, NL, 14 Mar. 2019

* Joined case with C-226/19. 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 SchengenBorders 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?

CJEU C-225/19
 interpr. of Reg. 810/2009 on referred from Rechtbank Den Haag (z)p Haarlem, NL, 14 Mar. 2019

* Joined case with C-226/19. 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 SchengenBorders 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?

CJEU C-35/20

* On the issue whether a domestic obligation to carry a passport is consistent with Union law. Is the penalty, normally imposed in Finland in the form of daily fines for crossing the Finnish border without carrying a valid travel document, compatible with the principle of proportionality that follows from Article 27(2) of Dir. 2004/38 on Free Movement?

2.3.3 ECHR Judgments on Borders and Visas

ECtHR 23 July 2013, 55352/12
 violation of Art. 5

* The case concerns a migrant who had entered Malta in an irregular manner by boat. The ECtHR found a violation of art. 5(1), mainly due to the failure of the Maltese authorities to pursue deportation or to do so with due diligence, and of art. 5(4) due to absence of an effective and speedy domestic remedy to challenge the lawfulness of their detention.

Also, the ECtHR requested the Maltese authorities (Art. 46) to establish a mechanism allowing a determination of the lawfulness of immigration detention within a reasonable time-limit. In this case the Court for the first time found Malta in violation of art. 3 because of the immigration detention conditions. Those conditions in which the applicant had been living for 14½ months were, taken as a whole, amounted to degrading treatment.

ECtHR 19 Dec. 2013, 53608/11
 violation of Art. 3 + 13

* The applicant was an Iranian journalist who alleged to have been arrested and tortured due to his involvement in protests against the government. After his arrival in Greece a decision had been taken to return him to Turkey, and he had been held in custody in a police station and in various detention centres. His application for asylum was first not registered by the Greek authorities, and later they dismissed the application. The application mainly concerned the conditions of detention, in particular overcrowding, unhygienic conditions, lack of external contact, and lack of access to telephone, translators and any kind of information. Referring to its previous case law, the ECtHR held these conditions to be in violation of Art. 3. As there had been no effective domestic remedy against that situation, Art. 3 in combination with art. 3 had also been violated.

ECtHR 21 Feb. 2012, 27765/09
 violation of Art. 3 + 13

* The Court concluded that the decision of the Italian authorities to send TCNs - who were intercepted outside the territorial waters of Italy - back to Libya, had exposed them to the risk of ill-treatment there, as well as to the risk of ill-
treatment if they were sent back to their countries of origin (Somalia and Eritrea). For the first time the Court applied Article 4 of Protocol no. 4 (prohibition of collective expulsion) in the circumstance of aliens who were not physically present on the territory of the State, but in the high seas. Italy was also held responsible for exposing the aliens to a treatment in violation with Article 3 ECHR, as it transferred them to Libya 'in full knowledge of the facts' and circumstances in Libya. The Court also concluded that they had had no effective remedy in Italy against the alleged violations (Art. 13).

- **ECtHR 4 Dec. 2018, 43639/12**  
  * Khanh v. CYP  
  ECLI:CE:ECHR:2018:1204JUD004363912

- **violation of**  
  ECHR:Art. 3  
  * 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 28 Feb. 2012, 11463/09**  
  * Samaras v. GRE  
  ECLI:CE:ECHR:2012:0228JUD001146309

- **violation of**  
  ECHR:Art. 3  
  * The conditions of detention of the applicants (one Somali and twelve Greek nationals) at Ioannina prison were held to constitute degrading treatment in violation of ECHR art. 3.

- **ECtHR 20 Dec. 2016, 19356/07**  
  * Shioshvili a.o. v. RUS  
  ECLI:CE:ECHR:2016:1220JUD001935607

- **violation of**  
  ECHR:Art. 3+13  
  * 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.
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3.1 Irregular Migration: Adopted Measures

**Directive 2001/51**
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**
Establishing a secure web-based Information and Coordination Network for MS’ Migration Management Services
* OJ 2005 L 83/48
UK opt in
Repealed by Reg. 2016/1624 (Borders and Coast Guard).

**Directive 2009/52**
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**
Assistance with transit for expulsion by air
* OJ 2003 L 321/26

**Decision 191/2004**
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**
Mutual recognition of expulsion decisions of TCNs
* OJ 2001 L 149/34
impl. date 2 Oct. 2002
UK opt in

**Decision 573/2004**
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**
Transit via land for expulsion
* adopted 22 Dec. 2003 by Council
UK opt in

**Regulation 2019/1240**
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**
Making returns more effective when implementing the Returns Directive
* OJ 2017 L 66/15

**Directive 2008/115**
On common standards and procedures in MSs for returning illegally staying TCNs
* OJ 2008 L 348/98
impl. date 24 Dec. 2010

**CJEU judgments**

- **Case W.T.**
  CJEU 11 June 2020, C-448/19
  Art. 3(1)(a) - inadmissable

- **Case Orrego Arias**
  CJEU 3 Sep. 2015, C-456/14
  Art. 13

- **Case Arib**
  CJEU 19 Mar. 2019, C-444/17
  Art. 2(2)(a)

- **Case X.**
  CJEU 26 Sep. 2018, C-175/17
  Art. 13

- **Case Gnandi**
  CJEU 19 June 2018, C-181/16
  Art. 5

- **Case K.A. a.o.**
  CJEU 8 May 2018, C-82/16
  Art. 5+11+13

- **Case Petrea**
  CJEU 14 Sep. 2017, C-184/16
  Art. 6(1)

- **Case Ouhrami**
  CJEU 26 July 2017, C-225/16
  Art. 11(2)

- **Case Affum**
  CJEU 7 June 2016, C-47/15
  Art. 2(1)+3(2)

- **Case Celaj**
  CJEU 1 Oct. 2015, C-290/14
  Art. 7(4)

- **Case Zh. & O.**
  CJEU 11 June 2015, C-554/13
  Art. 4(2)+6(1)

- **Case Zaizoune**
  CJEU 23 Apr. 2015, C-38/14
  Art. 5+13

- **Case Abdida**
  CJEU 18 Dec. 2014, C-562/13
  Art. 5+13
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- **Decision 575/2007**
  
  *Establishing the Eur. Return Fund as part of the General Programme Solidarity and Management of Migration Flows*
  
  - OJ 2007 L 144
  - Repealed by Reg. 516/2014 (Asylum, Migration and Integration Fund).

- **Directive 2011/36**
  
  *On preventing and combating trafficking in human beings and protecting its victims*
  
  - OJ 2011 L 101/1
  - Replacing Framework Decision 2002/629 (OJ 2002 L 203/1)

- **Directive 2004/81**
  
  *Residence permits for TCNs who are victims of trafficking*
  
  - OJ 2004 L 261/19

- **Directive 2002/90**
  
  *Unauthorized Entry*
  
  - OJ 2002 L 328

- **ECtHR**
  
  *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

- **ECtHR Judgments**
  
  - OJ 2002 L 328
  - Implied date 31 Aug. 1954
3.1 Irregular Migration: Adopted Measures

3.2 Irregular Migration: Proposed Measures

Directive
Amending Return Directive
* COM (2018) 634, 12 Sep 2018
Council agreed position in June 2019; no EP position yet

3.3 Irregular Migration: Jurisprudence

3.3.1 CJEU Judgments on Irregular Migration

- ECHR 31 July 2012, 14902/10 Mahmundi Art. 5
- ECHR 21 Feb. 2012, 27765/09 Hirsi Prot. 4 Art. 4
- ECHR 20 Sep. 2011, 10816/10 Lokpo & Touré Art. 5

See further: § 3.3

Irregular Migration: Jurisprudence

case law sorted in alphabetical order

- **CJEU 18 Dec. 2014, C-562/13** Abida ECLI:EU:C:2014:2453
  * interpr. of Dir. 2008/115 Return Directive Art. 5+13
  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 6 Dec. 2011, C-329/11** Achughhabian ECLI:EU:C:2011:807
  * interpr. of Dir. 2008/115 Return Directive
  ref. from Cour 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 7 June 2016, C-47/15** Affum ECLI:EU:C:2016:408
  * interpr. of Dir. 2008/115 Return Directive Art. 2(1)+3(2)
  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 19 Mar. 2019, C-444/17** Arib ECLI:EU:C:2019:220
  * interpr. of Dir. 2008/115 Return Directive Art. 2(2)(a)
  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 30 May 2013, C-534/11** Arslan ECLI:EU:C:2013:343
  * interpr. of Dir. 2008/115 Return Directive Art. 2(1)
  ref. from Nevyssší 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 17 July 2014, C-473/13**  
Bero & Bouzalma  
AG 30 Apr. 2014  
* interpr. of Dir. 2008/115  
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 11 Dec. 2014, C-249/13**  
Boudjlida  
AG 25 June 2014  
* interpr. of Dir. 2008/115  
ref. from Tribunal administratif de Pau, France, 6 May 2013  
* To the right to be heard the national court 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 1 Oct. 2015, C-290/14**  
Celaj  
AG 28 Apr. 2015  
* interpr. of Dir. 2008/115  
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 28 Apr. 2011, C-61/11 (PPU)**  
El Dridi  
AG 28 Apr. 2011  
* interpr. of Dir. 2008/115  
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 19 Sep. 2013, C-297/12**  
Filev & Osmani  
AG 23 Aug. 2013  
* interpr. of Dir. 2008/115  
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 10 Sep. 2013, C-383/13 (PPU)**  
G. & R.  
AG 22 Feb. 2018  
* interpr. of Dir. 2008/115  
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 19 June 2018, C-181/16**  
Gnandi  
AG 26 Oct. 2017  
* interpr. of Dir. 2008/115  
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 8 May 2018, C-82/16**  
K.A. a.o.  
AG 26 Oct. 2017  
* interpr. of Dir. 2008/115  
ref. from Raad voor Vreemdelingenbewinstingen, Belgium, 12 Feb. 2016  
* Art. 3 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 30 Nov. 2009, C-357/09 (PPU)  
Kadzoev  
AG 10 Nov. 2009  
ECLI:EU:C:2009:741
* interp. of Dir. 2008/115  
Return Directive Art. 15(4), (5) + (6)  
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 5 June 2014, C-146/14 (PPU)  
Mahdi  
AG 14 May 2014  
ECLI:EU:C:2014:1320
* interp. of Dir. 2008/115  
Return Directive Art. 15  
ref. from Ufficio del Giudice di Pace Lecce, Italy, 22 Sep. 2011  
* 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 21 Mar. 2013, C-522/11  
Mhay  
ECLI:EU:C:2013:190
* interp. of Dir. 2008/115  
Return Directive Art. 2(2)(b)+7(4)  
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 5 Nov. 2014, C-166/13  
Mukarubega  
AG 25 June 2014  
ECLI:EU:C:2014:2336
* interp. of Dir. 2008/115  
Return Directive Art. 3+7  
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 3 Sep. 2015, C-456/14  
Orrego Arias  
ECLI:EU:C:2015:550
* interp. of Dir. 2001/40  
Expulsion Decisions Art. 3(1)(a) - inadmissible  
ref. from Tribunal Superior de Justicia de 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 inadmissible.

>>> CJEU 26 July 2017, C-225/16  
Ouhrami  
AG 18 May 2017  
ECLI:EU:C:2017:590
* interp. of Dir. 2008/115  
Return Directive Art. 11(2)  
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 25 May 2016, C-218/15  
Pavletti a.o.  
AG 26 May 2016  
ECLI:EU:C:2016:748
* interp. of Dir. 2002/90  
Unauthorized Entry Art. 1  
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 14 Sep. 2017, C-184/16  
Petrea  
AG 27 Apr. 2017  
ECLI:EU:C:2017:684
* interp. of Dir. 2008/115  
Return Directive Art. 6(1)  
ref. from Dioikikto 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 17 July 2014, C-474/13**
AG 30 Apr. 2014
interpr. of Dir. 2008/115
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 6 Dec. 2012, C-430/11**
ref. from Tribunale di Adria, Italy, 18 Aug. 2011

* **CJEU 10 Apr. 2012, C-83/12**
AG 26 Mar. 2012
interpr. of Dir. 2002/90
ref. from Bundesgerichtshof, Germany, 17 Feb. 2012
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) cannot 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 11 June 2020, C-448/19**
ref. from Tribunal Superior de Justicia de Castilla-La Mancha, Spain, 12 June 2019
Art. 12 of Dir. 2003/109 must be interpreted as precluding legislation of a MS which, as interpreted by national case-law with reference to Council Directive 2001/40, provides for the expulsion of any third-country national who holds a long-term residence permit who has committed a criminal offence punishable by a custodial sentence of at least one year, without it being necessary to examine whether the third country national represents a genuine and sufficiently serious threat to public order or public security or to take into account the duration of residence in the territory of that Member State, the age of the person concerned, the consequences of expulsion for the person concerned and family members and the links with the country of residence or the absence of links with the country of origin.

* **CJEU 26 Sep. 2018, C-175/17**
AG 24 Jan. 2018
interpr. of Dir. 2008/115
ref. from Raad van State, NL, 6 Apr. 2017
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 suspensive effect even in the case where the person concerned invokes a serious risk of infringement of the principle of non-refoulement.

* **CJEU 23 Apr. 2015, C-38/14**
ref. from Tribunal Superior de Justicia del Pais Vasco, Spain, 27 Jan. 2014

* **CJEU 11 June 2015, C-554/13**
AG 12 Feb. 2015
interpr. of Dir. 2008/115
ref. from Raad van State, NL, 28 Oct. 2013
(1) Art. 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) Art. 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) Art. 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 TCN 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

**M.A.**
**CJEU C-112/20**
Ref. from Bundesgerichtshof, Germany, 11 Jan. 2019
* Should Art. 5 of the Return Dir., which requires Member States, when implementing the directive, to take account of the best interests of the child, together with Art. 13 of that directive and Art. 24 and 47 of the Charter, be interpreted as requiring the best interests of the child, an EU citizen, to be taken into account even if the return decision is taken with regard to the child’s parent alone?**

**B.**
**CJEU C-233/19**
Ref. from Tribunal Superior de Justicia de Castilla La Mancha, Spain,
* Is the Return Directive applicable in cases of removal of a TCN with international protection in another MS to that MS?**

**Com. v. Hungary**
**CJEU C-808/18**
Ref. from European Commission, EU, 21 Dec. 2018
* Whether Hungary has failed to fulfil its obligations under the Return Directive and the Charter.**

**J.Z.**
**CJEU C-806/18**
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 endorsing 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?**

**L.M.**
**CJEU C-402/19**
Ref. from Conseil d’Etat, Belgium, 28 Feb. 2020
* Should a decision ordering a TCN to leave the territory of the MS (recurrent sickle cell crises and the need for surgery in order to prevent paralysis)?**

**M.O.**
**CJEU C-568/19**
Ref. from Tribunal Superior de Justicia de 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).**

**T.Q.**
**CJEU C-441/19**
Ref. from Rechtbank Den Haag (zp) Den Bosch, NL, 12 June 2019
* On the enforcement of return decisions and unaccompanied minors.**

**W.M.**
**CJEU C-118/19**
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?

**Westerdalldres**

* interpr. of Dir. 2008/115
* 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 13 June 2013, 53709/11**  
**A.F. v. GRE**  
violation of  
ECHR: Art. 5

An Iranian entering Greece from Turkey had initially not been registered as an asylum seeker by the Greek authorities, which ordered his return to Turkey. However, the Turkish authorities refused to readmit him into Turkey, and he was then detained by the Greek police. Against the background of reports from Greek and international organisations, having visited the relevant police detention facilities either during the applicant’s detention or shortly after his release – including the European Committee for the Prevention of Torture, the UN Special Rapporteur on Torture, the German NGO ProAsyl and the Greek National Human Rights Commission – the ECtHR found a violation of art. 3 due to the serious lack of space available to the applicant, also taking the duration of his detention into account. It was thus unnecessary for the Court to examine the applicant’s other allegations concerning the detention conditions (art 5 ECHR) which the Government disputed. Yet, the Court noted that the Government’s statements in this regard were not in accordance with the findings of the abovementioned organisations.

**ECtHR 23 Oct. 2012, 13058/11**  
**Abdelhamik v. HUN**  
violation of  
ECHR: Art. 5

* This case concerns unlawful detention, without effective judicial review, of an asylum seeker during the examination of his asylum application. The applicant was a Palestinian who had been stopped at the Hungarian border control for using a forged passport.

**ECtHR 25 Sep. 2012, 50520/09**  
**Ahmed v. GRE**  
violation of  
ECHR: Art. 5

The conditions of detention of the applicant Afghan asylum seeker in two police stations in Athens were found to constitute degrading treatment in breach of ECHR art. 3 Since Greek law did not allow the courts to examine the conditions of detention in centres for irregular immigrants, the applicant did not have an effective remedy in that regard, in violation of ECHR art. 13 taken together with art. 3. The Court found an additional violation of ECHR art. 13 taken together with art. 3, resulting from the structural deficiencies of the Greek asylum system, as evidenced by the period during which the applicant had been awaiting the outcome of his appeal against the refusal of asylum, and the risk that he might be deported before his asylum appeal had been examined. ECHR art. 5 para. 4 was violated due to the lack of judicial competence to review the lawfulness of the deportation constituting the legal basis of detention.

**ECtHR 2 Mar. 2017, 59727/13**  
**Ahmed v. UK**  
no violation of  
ECHR: Art. 5(1)

* 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 Elimi 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 25 June 2019, 10112/16**  
**Al Husin v. BOS**  
violation of  
ECHR: Art. 5

* 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 ECHR, 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 23 Oct. 2012, 13457/11**  
**Ali Said v. HUN**  
violation of  
ECHR: Art. 5

* This case concerns unlawful detention, without effective judicial review, of an asylum seeker during the examination of his asylum application. The applicants were Iraqi nationals who illegally entered Hungary, applied for asylum and then travelled illegally to the Netherlands from where they were transferred back to Hungary under the Dublin Regulation.

**Hirsö v. ITA**  
ECLI:CE:ECHR:2012:0221JUD002776509
3.3: Irregular Migration: Jurisprudence: ECtHR Judgments

ECtHR 25 Apr. 2019, 62824/16
* violation of
ECHRI:Art. 5

ECtHR 21 Feb. 2012, 27765/09
* violation of
ECHRI:Prot. 4 Art. 4

The Court concluded that the decision of the Italian authorities to send TCNs - who were intercepted outside the territorial waters of Italy - back to Libya, had exposed them to the risk of ill-treatment there, as well as to the risk of ill-treatment if they were sent back to their countries of origin (Somalia and Eritrea). They also had been subjected to collective expulsion prohibited by Art. 4 of Protocol No. 4. The Court also concluded that they had no effective remedy in Italy against the alleged violations.

ECtHR 6 Nov. 2018, 52548/15
K.G. v. BEL
ECLI:CE:ECHR:2018:1106JUD0005254815

ECtHR 6 Oct. 2016, 3342/11
Justified

The applicants, consisted of a couple of Nigerian national; each of them with a daughter. They were kept however in detention. They had already been kept in detention from the 29th of May 2015 until 15th of November 2015, and were notified of the decision by the police on the 15th of November 2015. They challenged the legality of their detention on the grounds of their daughter’s health. The court held that the detention order had been made on the basis of the applicant’s proximity to the administrative asylum procedure. The detention order was not sufficiently proportionate. It also highlighted the squalid conditions of detention. The Court held that the detention order was arbitrary.

ECtHR 20 Sep. 2011, 10816/10
Lokpo & Touré v. HUN
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 31 July 2012, 14902/10
Mahmundi v. GRE
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.

ECtHR 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 4 Apr. 2017, 23707/15
Mucumba Oyaw v. BEL
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 6 Oct. 2016, 3342/11
Richmond Yaw v. ITA
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 4 Apr. 2017, 39061/11
Thimothawes v. BEL
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 acquires 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 25 Apr. 2019, 62824/16
V.M. v. UK
ECLI:CE:ECHR:2019:0425JUD0006282416

* 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 acquires 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.
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 were 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.
## 4.1 External Treaties: Association Agreements

### 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**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Art.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10 July 2019</td>
<td>A.</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Aug. 2018</td>
<td>Yün</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 Mar. 2017</td>
<td>Tekdemir</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Dec. 2016</td>
<td>Ucar a.o.</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Sep. 2014</td>
<td>Essent</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Nov. 2012</td>
<td>Gülbahçe</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 July 2012</td>
<td>Dülger</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 Mar. 2012</td>
<td>Kahveci &amp; Inan</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Nov. 2011</td>
<td>Ziebell Örnek</td>
<td>14(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Nov. 2011</td>
<td>Dereci al</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 Sep. 2011</td>
<td>Unal</td>
<td>6(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 June 2011</td>
<td>Pehlivan</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Dec. 2010</td>
<td>Metin Bozkurt</td>
<td>7+14(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Dec. 2010</td>
<td>Toprak &amp; Özgür</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 Apr. 2010</td>
<td>Com. v. NL</td>
<td>10(1)+13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Feb. 2010</td>
<td>Genc (Hava)</td>
<td>6(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Jan. 2010</td>
<td>Bekleyen</td>
<td>7(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Sep. 2009</td>
<td>Sahin</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Dec. 2008</td>
<td>Altun</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 Sep. 2008</td>
<td>Er</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 Jan. 2008</td>
<td>Payir</td>
<td>6(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Oct. 2007</td>
<td>Polat</td>
<td>7+14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 July 2007</td>
<td>Derin</td>
<td>6, 7 and 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 Oct. 2006</td>
<td>Güzeli</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Feb. 2006</td>
<td>Torun</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Jan. 2006</td>
<td>Sedef</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 July 2005</td>
<td>Aydinli</td>
<td>6+7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 July 2005</td>
<td>Dogan (Ergül)</td>
<td>6(1) + (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 July 2005</td>
<td>Gürol</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 June 2005</td>
<td>Dörr &amp; Unal</td>
<td>6(1)+14(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Nov. 2004</td>
<td>Cetinkaya</td>
<td>7+14(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Sep. 2004</td>
<td>Ayaz</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Sep. 2004</td>
<td>Com. v. Austria</td>
<td>10(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Oct. 2003</td>
<td>Abatay &amp; Sahin</td>
<td>13+41(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 May 2003</td>
<td>Birlikte</td>
<td>10(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Nov. 2002</td>
<td>Kurz (Yuze)</td>
<td>6(1)+7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Sep. 2000</td>
<td>Bicakci</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 June 2000</td>
<td>Eyüp</td>
<td>7(1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 4.1: External Treaties: Association Agreements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Case Reference</th>
<th>Judgment</th>
<th>Article(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16 Mar. 2000</td>
<td>C-329/97</td>
<td>Ergat</td>
<td>Art. 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Feb. 2000</td>
<td>C-340/97</td>
<td>Nazli</td>
<td>Art. 6(1)+14(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 Nov. 1998</td>
<td>C-1/97</td>
<td>Birdan</td>
<td>Art. 6(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Nov. 1998</td>
<td>C-210/97</td>
<td>Akman</td>
<td>Art. 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Sep. 1997</td>
<td>C-98/96</td>
<td>Ertanir</td>
<td>Art. 6(1)+6(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Sep. 1997</td>
<td>C-36/96</td>
<td>Günaydin</td>
<td>Art. 6(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 June 1997</td>
<td>C-285/95</td>
<td>Kol</td>
<td>Art. 6(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 May 1997</td>
<td>C-386/95</td>
<td>Eker</td>
<td>Art. 6(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Apr. 1997</td>
<td>C-351/95</td>
<td>Kadiman</td>
<td>Art. 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 Jan. 1997</td>
<td>C-171/95</td>
<td>Tetik</td>
<td>Art. 6(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 June 1995</td>
<td>C-434/93</td>
<td>Ahmet Bozkurt</td>
<td>Art. 6(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Oct. 1994</td>
<td>C-355/93</td>
<td>Eroglu</td>
<td>Art. 6(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Dec. 1992</td>
<td>C-237/91</td>
<td>Kus</td>
<td>Art. 6(1)+6(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Sep. 1990</td>
<td>C-192/89</td>
<td>Sevince</td>
<td>Art. 6(1)+13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Sep. 1987</td>
<td>C-12/86</td>
<td>Demirel</td>
<td>Art. 7+12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See further: § 4.4

#### EEC-Turkey Association Agreement Decision 3/80

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Case Reference</th>
<th>Judgment</th>
<th>Article(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13 Feb. 2020</td>
<td>C-258/18</td>
<td>Solak</td>
<td>Art. 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 May 2019</td>
<td>C-677/17</td>
<td>Çoban</td>
<td>Art. 6(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Jan. 2015</td>
<td>C-171/13</td>
<td>Demirci a.o.</td>
<td>Art. 6(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 May 2011</td>
<td>C-485/07</td>
<td>Akdas</td>
<td>Art. 6(1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See further: § 4.4

#### Albania

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

#### Armenia


#### Azerbaijan


#### Belarus

* OJ 2020 L 181/3

#### Bosnia and Herzegovina

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

#### Cape Verde


#### Georgia

* OJ 2011 L 52/47 into force 1 Mar. 2011 UK opt in

### 4.2: External Treaties: Readmission

#### Hong Kong

* OJ 2004 L 17/23 into force 1 May 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 UK opt in
* into force for TCN: Jan. 2010

#### Moldova

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

#### Montenegro

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

#### Morocco, Algeria, and China

See further: § 4.4
4.2: External Treaties: Readmission

* negotiation mandate approved by Council

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

**Russia**
* OJ 2007 L 129 into force for TCN: Jun. 2010
  * into force for TCN: Jan. 2010

**Serbia**
* OJ 2005 L 124/43 into force 1 May 2005
  * into force for TCN: Jan. 2010

**Sri Lanka**
* OJ 2005 L 124/43 into force 1 May 2005
  * into force for TCN: Jan. 2010

**Turkey**
  * Additional provisions as of 1 June 2016

**Ukraine**
  * into force for TCN: Jan. 2010

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

  * CJEU judgments
    - CJEU 27 Feb. 2017, T-192/16

  * N.F. v. European Council inadm.

  * See further: § 4.4

**Albania, Bosnia, Montenegro, Macedonia, Serbia: visa**
* OJ 2007 L 334 impl. date 1 Jan. 2008

**Armenia: visa**

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

**New Belarus: visa**
* OJ 2020 L 180/3

**Brazil: short-stay visa waiver for holders of diplomatic or official passports**
* OJ 2011 L 66/1 into force 24 Feb. 2019

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

**Cape Verde: visa**

**China: Approved Destination Status treaty**
* OJ 2004 L 83/12 into force 1 May 2014

**Denmark: Dublin II treaty**
* OJ 2006 L 66/38 into force 1 Apr. 2006

**Georgia: visa**
* OJ 2012 C 169/E

**Mauritius, Antigua/Barbuda, Barbados, Seychelles, St. Kitts and Nevis and Bahamas: visa abolition**
* OJ 2009 L 169 into force 1 May 2009

**Moldova: visa**
* OJ 2013 L 168/3 into force 1 July 2013

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

4.3 External Treaties: Other

**Norway and Iceland: Dublin Convention**
4.4.1 CJEU Judgments on EEC-Turkey Association Agreement

**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 into force 1 Dec. 2008

**Ukraine: visa**
* OJ 2013 L 168/11 into force 1 July 2013

### 4.4 External Treaties: Jurisprudence

**4.4.1 CJEU Judgments on EEC-Turkey Association Agreement**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Ref.</th>
<th>Decision</th>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Case Law Sorted</th>
<th>ECLI Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

* 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 into force 1 Dec. 2008

**Ukraine: visa**
* OJ 2013 L 168/11 into force 1 July 2013
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 18 Dec. 2008, C-337/07**  
Altun  
AG 11 Sep. 2008  
* interpr. of  
ref. from Verwaltungsgericht Köln, Germany, 2 June 1997

**CJEU 30 Sep. 2004, C-275/02**  
Ayaz  
AG 25 May 2004  
* interpr. of  
ref. from Verwaltungsgericht Stuttgart, Germany, 20 July 2007

**CJEU 7 Jul. 2005, C-373/03**  
Aydinli  
* interpr. of  
ref. from Verwaltungsgericht Freiburg, Germany, 12 Mar. 2003

**CJEU 21 Jan. 2010, C-462/08**  
Bekleyen  
AG 29 Oct. 2009  
* interpr. of  
ref. from Oberverwaltungsgericht Berlin-Brandenburg, Germany, 27 Oct. 2008

**CJEU 19 Sep. 2000, C-89/00**  
Bicakci  
AG 28 May 1998  
* interpr. of  
ref. from Verwaltungsgericht Berlin, Germany, 8 Mar. 2000

**CJEU 8 May 2003, C-171/01**  
Birlikte  
AG 12 Dec. 2002  
* interpr. of  
ref. from Verfassungsgerichtshof, Austria, 19 Apr. 2001

**CJEU 11 Nov. 2004, C-467/02**  
Cetinkaya  
AG 10 June 2004  
* interpr. of  
ref. from Verwaltungsgericht Stuttgart, Germany, 19 Dec. 2002

**CJEU 15 May 2019, C-677/17**  
Çoban  
AG 28 Feb. 2019  
* interpr. of  
ref. from Centrale Raad van Beroep, NL, 1 Dec. 2017

The meaning of a “family member” is analogous to its meaning in the Free Movement Regulation.

**CJEU 7 Jul. 2005, C-373/03**  
* interpr. of  
ref. from Verwaltungsgericht Stuttgart, Germany, 26 July 2002

**CJEU 21 Jan. 2010, C-462/08**  
* interpr. of  
ref. from Oberverwaltungsgericht Berlin-Brandenburg, Germany, 27 Oct. 2008

**CJEU 19 Sep. 2000, C-89/00**  
* interpr. of  
ref. from Verwaltungsgericht Berlin, Germany, 8 Mar. 2000

**CJEU 26 Nov. 1998, C-1/97**  
Birden  
AG 28 May 1998  
* interpr. of  
ref. from Verwaltungsgericht Berlin, Germany, 8 Mar. 2000

**CJEU 8 May 2003, C-171/01**  
Birlikte  
AG 12 Dec. 2002  
* interpr. of  
ref. from Verfassungsgerichtshof, Austria, 19 Apr. 2001

**CJEU 11 Nov. 2004, C-467/02**  
Cetinkaya  
AG 10 June 2004  
* interpr. of  
ref. from Verwaltungsgericht Stuttgart, Germany, 19 Dec. 2002

**CJEU 15 May 2019, C-677/17**  
Çoban  
AG 28 Feb. 2019  
* interpr. of  
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).
The ref. from Verwaltungsgericht Berlin, Germany, 19 Mar. 2013
AG 30 Apr. 2014

Return to labour market: no loss due to imprisonment.


territory of the MS concerned for a significant length of time without legitimate reason.

ref. from Verwaltungsgericht Darmstadt, Germany, 17 Aug. 2005
http://curia.europa.eu/juris/liste.jsf?language=en&num=C-325/05

CJEU 18 July 2007, C-325/05
Member State concerned must be considered to be a ‘new restriction’ within the meaning of that provision.

ref. from Verwaltungsgerichtshof, Austria, 25 May 2011
AG 29 Sep. 2011

CJEU 14 July 2013, C-225/12

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’.

ref. from Centrale Raad van Beroep, NL, 8 Apr. 2013
AG 10 July 2014

CJEU 15 Nov. 2011, C-256/11

ref. from Oberverwaltungsgericht Berlin, Germany, 11 May 2011
AG 11 Apr. 2013

CJEU 24 Sep. 2013, C-221/11

Demirkan

AG 11 Apr. 2013

interpr. of Protocol; Art. 41(1)
Dec. 1/80:Art. 13
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 14 Jan. 2015, C-171/13

Demirci a.o.

AG 10 July 2014

interpr. of Dec. 3/80:Art. 6(1)
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 30 Sep. 1987, C-12/86

Demirel

AG 19 May 1987

interpr. of Dec. 1/80:Art. 7+12
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 7 July 2005, C-383/03

Dogan (Ergül)

interpr. of Dec. 1/80:Art. 0(1)+ (2)
ref. from Verwaltungsgerichtshof, Austria, 4 Sep. 2003

* 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 18 July 2014, C-138/13

Dogan (Naima)

AG 30 Apr. 2014

interpr. of Protocol; Art. 41(1)
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 2 June 2005, C-136/03**
Dörr & Unal
ECLI:EU:C:2005:340
AG 21 Oct. 2004

* interpr. of Dec. 1/80:Art. 6(1)+14(1)
ref. from Verwaltungsgerichtshof, Austria, 18 Mar. 2003
* The procedural guarantees set out in the Dir. on Free Movement also apply to Turkish workers.

**CJEU 19 July 2012, C-451/11**
Dülger
ECLI:EU:C:2012:331
AG 7 June 2012

* interpr. of Dec. 1/80:Art. 7
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 29 May 1997, C-386/95**
Eker
ECLI:EU:C:1997:257
AG 6 Mar. 1997

* interpr. of Dec. 1/80:Art. 6(1)
ref. from Bundesverwaltungsgericht, Germany, 11 Dec. 1995
* On the meaning of “same employer”.

**CJEU 25 Sep. 2008, C-453/07**
Er
ECLI:EU:C:2008:524
AG 3 June 1999

* interpr. of Dec. 1/80:Art. 7
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 16 Mar. 2000, C-329/97**
Ergat
ECLI:EU:C:2000:133
AG 3 June 1999

* interpr. of Dec. 1/80:Art. 7
ref. from Bundesverwaltungsgericht, Germany, 22 Sep. 1997
* No loss of residence right in case of application for renewal residence permit after expiration date.

**CJEU 5 Oct. 1994, C-355/93**
Eroglu
ECLI:EU:C:1994:369
AG 12 July 1994

* interpr. of Dec. 1/80:Art. 6(1)
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 30 Sep. 1997, C-98/96**
Ertanir
ECLI:EU:C:1997:446
AG 29 Apr. 1997

* interpr. of Dec. 1/80:Art. 6(1)+6(3)
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 11 Sep. 2014, C-91/13**
Essent
ECLI:EU:C:2014:2206
AG 8 May 2014

* interpr. of Dec. 1/80:Art. 13
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 22 June 2000, C-65/98**
Eyüp
ECLI:EU:C:2000:336
AG 18 Nov. 1999

* interpr. of Dec. 1/80:Art. 6(1)+14(1)
ref. from Verwaltungsgerichtshof, Austria, 23 Sep. 1999
* The procedural guarantees set out in the Dir. on Free Movement also apply to Turkish workers.
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 the 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.

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.
### 4.4: External Treaties: Jurisprudence: CJEU Judgments on EEC-Turkey Association

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Facts and Key Provisions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AG 16 Jan. 1997</td>
<td>Dec. 1/80: Art. 7</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CJEU 29 Mar. 2012, C-7/10</td>
<td>Dec. 1/80: Art. 7</td>
<td>By Art. 87(1) of the Treaty, the third indent of 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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CJEU 19 Nov. 2002, C-188/00</td>
<td>Dec. 1/80: Art. 6(1)+7</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CJEU 16 Dec. 1992, C-237/91</td>
<td>Dec. 1/80: Art. 6(1)+6(3)</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CJEU 10 Feb. 2000, C-340/97</td>
<td>Dec. 1/80: Art. 6(1)+14(1)</td>
<td>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</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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 24 Jan. 2008, C-294/06** Payir ECLI:EU:C:2008:36
Ref. from Raad van State, NL, 8 June 1989
AG 18 July 2007
Dec. 1/80: Art. 6(1)
Dec. 1/80: Art. 6(2)
Interpr. of
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 16 June 2011, C-484/07** Pehlivan ECLI:EU:C:2011:395
Ref. from High Court of England and Wales, UK, 16 Feb. 1998
AG 25 Nov. 2000, C-37/98
AG 41(1)
CJEU 11 May 2000, C-379/98
AG 17 Sep. 2009, C-242/06
AG 25 Nov. 1999
AG 10 Jan. 2006, C-230/03
AG 6 Sep. 2005
AG 15 May 1990
* Art. 13 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.

* The Additional Protocol enters into force.

* Turkish worker during the first three years of his or her residence in the host Member State.

* ref. from Rechtbank Den Haag, NL, 31 Oct. 2007
* ref. from Court of Appeal, United Kingdom, 30 June 2006

* 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.

* ref. from Raad van State, NL, 8 June 1989
* 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.

* 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,
4.4: External Treaties: Jurisprudence: CJEU Judgments on EEC-Turkey Association

---

**F**

**CJEU 13 Feb. 2020, C-258/18**

Solak

ECLI:EU:C:2020:98

* interpr. of

Dec. 3/80:Art. 6

ref. from Centrale Raad van Beroep, NL, 13 Apr. 2018

* Art. 6(1) must be interpreted as not precluding a domestic measure under which the payment of a benefit in addition to disability benefits to ensure a minimum income granted under that scheme is terminated in respect of a Turkish national entering the regular labour market of a MS and who, having renounced the nationality of that MS acquired during his stay in that MS, has returned to his country of origin.

**F**

**CJEU 19 Feb. 2009, C-228/06**

Soysal

ECLI:EU:C:2009:101

* interpr. of

Protocol: Art. 41(1)

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.

**F**

**CJEU 29 Mar. 2017, C-652/15**

Tekdemir


ECLI:EU:C:2017:239

ECLI:EU:C:2016:960

* interpr. of

Dec. 1/80:Art. 13

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.

**F**

**CJEU 23 Jan. 1997, C-171/95**

Tetik

AG 14 Nov. 1996

ECLI:EU:C:1997:31

ECLI:EU:C:1996:438

* interpr. of

Dec. 1/80:Art. 6(1)

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.

**F**

**CJEU 9 Dec. 2010, C-300/09**

Toprak & Oguz

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.

**F**

**CJEU 16 Feb. 2006, C-502/04**

Torun

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 vocation 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.

**F**

**CJEU 20 Sep. 2007, C-16/05**

Tum & Dari

ECLI:EU:C:2007:530

ECLI:EU:C:2006:550

* interpr. of

Dec. 1/80:Art. 7

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.
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Two other identical cases T-193/16 (N.G.) and T-257/16 (N.M.) were also declared inadmissible on the ground of the Court’s lack of jurisdiction to hear and determine it.

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 inadmissible.