WHOSE RESPONSIBILITY?

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

Malin Thunberg Schunke



Intersentia Publishing Ltd.

Trinity House | Cambridge Business Park | Cowley Road

Cambridge | CB4 0WZ | United Kingdom

tel.: +44 1223 393 753 | email: mail@intersentia.co.uk

Distribution for the UK: Distribution for the USA and Canada:

NBN International International Specialized Book Services

Airport Business Centre, 10 Thornbury Road 920 NE 58th Ave Suite 300 Plymouth, PL6 7PP Portland, OR 97213

United Kingdom USA

Tel: +44 1752 202 301 Tel.: +1 800 944 6190 (toll free)

Distribution for Austria: Distribution for other countries:
Neuer Wissenschaftlicher Verlag Intersentia Publishing nv

Argentinierstraße 42/6 Groenstraat 31 1040 Wien 2640 Mortsel Austria Belgium

Tel.: +43 1 535 61 03 24 Tel.: +32 3 680 15 50

Email: office@nwv.at Email: mail@intersentia.be

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

Malin Thunberg Schunke

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

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

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

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

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

PREFACE

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

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

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

Malin Thunberg Schunke Hannover, April 2013

Intersentia V

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

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

Intersentia VII

CONTENTS

	acev		
Aboi	ut the author vii		
Abbi	reviationsxiii		
1.	Introduction		
1.1.	Being a defendant within the European Union: Garry Mann, Andrew		
	Symeou and the Stow brothers		
1.2.	The need for EU action on defence rights5		
1.3.	Scope and overall structure of the study6		
	1.3.1. The principle of mutual recognition of judicial decisions		
	1.3.2. The purpose of the project9		
2.	Human rights protection at the legislative level within the EU 13		
2.1.	EU instruments on criminal procedural rights		
2.2.	EU instruments on mutual recognition of decisions		
3.	Human rights protection at the national level		
3.1.	Introduction		
3.2.	Swedish legislation and case-law regarding the EAW		
	3.2.1. The Act (2003:1156) on Surrender from Sweden according to		
	the European Arrest Warrant		
	3.2.2. Swedish case-law		
	3.2.3. Commentary to the Swedish case-law		
3.3.	English legislation and case-law regarding the EAW		
	3.3.1. The Extradition Act 2003		
	3.3.2. English case-law		
	3.3.3. Commentary to the English case-law		
	3.3.4. National review of the extradition system		
	3.3.5. The UK's 2014 opt-out decision		
4.	Human rights protection and the ECtHR		
4.1.	Introduction		
4.2.	The principle of extraterritorial state responsibility		
4.3.	The ECHR and the European Union		

Intersentia ix

Whose Responsibility?

5.	The C	harter of Fundamental Rights and the CJEU	55
5.1.	The E	U Charter of Fundamental Rights	55
5.2.	The C	JEU	57
	5.2.1.	The Jurisdiction of the CJEU	57
	5.2.2.	The Radu and Melloni cases	58
		5.2.2.1. Criminal Proceedings against Radu	58
		5.2.2.2. Melloni v. Ministerio Fiscal	60
		5.2.2.3. Commentary	64
5.3.	The sy	stem of protecting fundamental rights after the Treaty of	
	Lisbo	n	68
6.	Is the	re a sufficient system of human rights protection within	
		eration based on mutual recognition?	69
6.1.	Introd	luction	69
6.2.	Natio	nal human rights bars	72
	6.2.1.	Introduction	72
	6.2.2.	Tight time limits	73
	6.2.3.	The burden of proof and evidentiary difficulties	75
	6.2.4.	The "political" element	79
	6.2.5.	The stringent threshold of "flagrant denial"	80
		Conclusions	
6.3.	The E	CtHR and the principles for extraterritorial state responsibility	83
	6.3.1.	Introduction	83
	6.3.2.	Overload and significant delays	84
	6.3.3.	The high threshold of "flagrant denial"	85
	6.3.4.	The need for more modern concepts of state responsibility	89
6.4.	Extra	territorial state responsibility and the principle of mutual	
	recogn	nition	93
	6.4.1.	1	
		6.4.1.1. What does mutual trust mean?	93
		6.4.1.2. The interpretation of mutual trust in practice	
		6.4.1.3. A rejection of blind trust by the European Courts	
		M.S.S. v. Belgium and Greece	100
		N.S. v. Secretary of State for the Home Department	
		and M.E. and Others v. Refugee Applications	
		Commissioner and Minister for Justice, Equality and	
		Law Reform	101
		6.4.1.4. Conclusions on the concept of mutual trust	103
	6.4.2.	The need for a higher standard of protection within the	
		mutual recognition system	
	6.4.3.	Division of labour within the system of mutual recognition	112

X Intersentia

Contents

6.5.	Hope for the future: The Charter and the CJEU?	118
	6.5.1. The impact of the Charter	118
	6.5.2. The CJEU as guardian of human rights	120
6.6.	The need for EU instruments on transnational procedural standards	123
7.	Whose responsibility?	131
Bibli	ography	135
Inde.	x	157

Intersentia xi

ABBREVIATIONS

AC Law Reports Appeal Court

Art. Article

BverfG BundesVerfassungsgericht
BvR Bundesverfassungsbeschwerden
CEPS Centre for European Policy Studies

CFI Court of First Instance

Charter The Charter of Fundamental Rights in the European Union

CJEU Court of Justice of the European Union

COLR Cork Online Law Review
Dir. Utredningsdirektiv
Dnr. Diarienummer
Ds. Departementsserien

EAW European Arrest Warrant

EAW Act Act (2003:1156) on Surrender from Sweden according to the

European Arrest Warrant

EC European Community

ECBA European Criminal Bar Association

ECHR The European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights

and Fundamental Freedoms

ECJ European Court of Justice ECR European Court Reports

ECtHR European Court of Human Rights

ed. Editor

EEW European Evidence Warrant
EIO European Investigation Order
EJN European Judicial Network

ERA Forum Journal of the Academy of European Law

ESO European Supervision Order

EU European Union

eucrim The European Criminal Law Associations' Forum

EUI European University Institute

Eur.J.Crime European Journal of Crime, Criminal Law and Criminal

Crim.L.& Justice

Crim.Just.

EWCA England and Wales Court of Appeal EWHC England and Wales High Court

Intersentia Xiii

FD Framework decision

FD on EAW Council Framework Decision 2002/584/JHA of 13 June 2002

on the European Arrest Warrant and the surrender procedures

between Member States

FD on EEW Council Framework Decision 2008/978/JHA of 18 December

2008 on the European Evidence Warrant for the Purpose of Obtaining Objects, Documents and Data for Use in

Proceedings in Criminal Matters

FD on Freezing Framework Decision 2003/577/JHA of 22 July 2003 on the

Execution in the European Union of Orders Freezing Property

or Evidence

Hanse LR Hanse Law Review

HD Högsta domstolen (Supreme Court in Sweden)
ICLQ The International and Comparative Law Quarterly
ICTR International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda

IEHC Ireland High Court
IESC Ireland Supreme Court
J. Crim. L Journal of Criminal Law
JHA Justice and Home Affairs
JIT Joint Investigation Team

JK Justitiekanslern/Chancellor of Justice

JO Justitieombudsmannen

JuU Justitieutskott

LJN Landelijk Jurisprudentie Nummer (dutch case-law number)

MIG Migrationsöverdomstolen MLR Modern Law Review NAW Nordic Arrest Warrant

NGO Non-governmental Organisation

NIQB Northern Ireland Queens Bench of High Court of Justice

NJA Nytt juridiskt arkiv, Avd. I

No. Number

OJ Official Journal of the European Union

OLG Oberlandesgericht

p. Page

Para. Paragraph prop. Proposition

QB Queen's Bench (Division) RB Rättegångsbalken (1942:740)

RIDP Revue Internationale de Droit Pénal Rskr. Riksdagsskrivelse (parliamentary papers)

SFS Svensk författningssamling

SIPRI Stockholm International Peace Research Institute

SOU Statens offentliga utredningar

xiv Intersentia

SvJT Svensk juristtidning

TEU Treaty on European Union

TFEU Treaty on the functioning of the European Union

UK United Kingdom

UKHL United Kingdom House of Lords UKSC United Kingdom Supreme Court

UN United Nations

UNTS United Nations Treaty Series

Utrecht L.Rev. Utrecht Law Review

v. Versus Vol. Volume

WLR Weekly Law Reports

ZaöRv Zeitschrift für ausländisches öffentliches Recht und

Völkerrecht

ZIS Zeitschrift für Internationale Strafrechtsdogmatik ZStW Zeitschrift für die gesamte Strafrechtswissenschaft

Intersentia XV