

Table of contents

Foreword	7
Introduction	
Gisèle VERNIMMEN-VAN TIGGELEN et Laura SURANO.....	9
1. L'émergence de la reconnaissance mutuelle	9
2. Le concept de reconnaissance mutuelle : ce qu'il signifie et ce qu'il implique..	11
3. L'état des lieux	12
4. L'étude sur l'avenir de la reconnaissance mutuelle en matière pénale	14
The implementation and application of mutual recognition instruments in Austria	
Robert KERT.....	17
1. Introduction.....	17
2. Perception of the principle of mutual recognition in Austrian doctrine and practice	18
A. The principle of mutual recognition	18
B. Criticisms of the principle of mutual recognition	19
C. Evaluation of the principle of mutual recognition	21
D. Limits of the principle of mutual recognition	22
E. Mutual recognition of final judgements and pre-trial decisions.....	23
F. Reasons not to recognise and execute a decision	23
G. Consistency between the existing instruments of legal assistance	27
H. Necessity of flanking measures.....	27
3. Transposition of mutual recognition instruments	28
A. Mutual recognition instruments transposed in Austrian law	28
B. Reasons for late transposition	29

C. Difficulties during the transposition process.....	31
D. Specific issues related to transposition	32
E. Decentralised procedure.....	38
4. Practical implementation of mutual recognition and other judicial cooperation instruments.....	38
A. General opinion of practitioners on mutual recognition instruments	39
B. Cooperation between different Member States on the basis of the mutual recognition instruments	39
C. Information of practitioners on new mutual recognition instruments.....	43
D. Role of practitioners at the stage of implementation	44
E. Record of single cases and feedback mechanisms	44
F. Application of the Framework Decision on mutual recognition of freezing orders in practice.....	44
5. Conclusions.....	45

La reconnaissance mutuelle en matière pénale en Belgique

Anne WEYEMBERGH et Veronica SANTAMARIA	47
--	----

1. Introduction.....	47
2. Perception générale de la reconnaissance mutuelle	48
A. Un concept dont il ne faut pas surestimer l'originalité	49
B. Une coopération qui n'est ni automatique ni sans limites	50
C. Un principe qui ne se suffit pas à lui-même : de la nécessité de mesures d'accompagnement	51
D. La reconnaissance mutuelle en matière pénale au sein de l'UE : un principe cohérent ?	53
3. Considérations générales sur la transposition du principe de la reconnaissance mutuelle en Belgique	56
A. Bilan général.....	56
B. Difficultés particulières rencontrées.....	58
C. Le choix de la décentralisation	60
4. Considérations générales sur la mise en œuvre pratique	61
A. Bilan général	61
B. Difficultés particulières rencontrées.....	62
C. L'implication et l'information des praticiens	69
5. Considérations transversales relatives à quelques motifs de refus	70
A. L'exigence de la double incrimination.....	70
B. La clause de territorialité.....	72
C. La nationalité et la résidence.....	73
D. Le respect des droits fondamentaux.....	74
6. Conclusion	76

L'application du principe de la reconnaissance mutuelle en matière pénale en Bulgarie

Margarita CHINOVA et Mila ASSENOVA	79
--	----

1. Introduction	79
2. Perception générale du principe de reconnaissance mutuelle.....	80

A. L'absence de définition du principe de reconnaissance mutuelle	80
B. Le mécanisme d'élaboration de la position nationale dans le cadre des négociations	82
C. La transposition des instruments de l'UE relatifs à la reconnaissance mutuelle.....	83
3. La mise en œuvre pratique du principe de reconnaissance mutuelle.....	91
A. L'application de la décision-cadre sur le MAE.....	91
B. L'application de la décision-cadre sur le gel.....	96
4. Conclusions et perspectives	96

Criminal law and mutual recognition in the Czech Republic

Ivo ŠLOSARČÍK	99
1. Introduction: Czech Republic, Presidency and mutual recognition	99
2. EU law in the Czech Republic	100
3. The <i>EAW</i> judgment of the Czech Constitutional Court	105
4. Problems of mutual recognition in criminal matters in the Czech Republic	108
A. The legality of penal sanctions and the double criminality test	108
B. Territoriality	109
C. Language accessibility	111
D. Special protection of Czech citizens (and residents)	112
5. Conclusion: Awaiting case law?	113

The perception of the principle of mutual recognition of judicial decisions in criminal matters in Germany

Thomas WAHL	115
1. Introduction.....	115
2. The current application of mutual recognition instruments.....	119
A. Implementation	119
B. General perception of the principle of mutual recognition in criminal matters.....	121
C. Mutual recognition and harmonisation of substantive law	122
D. Mutual recognition and approximation of procedural law	122
E. Grounds for refusal (I): the absence of double criminality	124
F. Grounds for refusal (II): the territoriality clause	127
G. Treatment of nationals and residents	128
H. The defence lawyers' position	131
3. Areas for other EU instruments.....	135
A. The rights of defence	135
B. Collection of evidence	136
C. Coordination of prosecutions.....	137
4. Methodology. Horizontal problems	138
A. Negotiations	138
B. Transposition.....	139
C. Application in practice	139
5. Mutual trust. Practical flanking measures.....	142
A. Mutual trust: myth or reality?	142

B. Flanking measures.....	142
6. Conclusions.....	144

Mutual recognition in criminal matters: the Danish experience

Jørn VESTERGAARD and Silvia ADAMO	147
1. Introduction.....	147
2. The two major acts implementing mutual recognition in Denmark	148
A. The 1967 Extradition Act, as amended in 2003 and subsequently	148
B. The 2004 Act on Execution of Decisions in Criminal Matters in the EU	157
3. Transposition of mutual recognition instruments	159
A. Constitutional setting and parliamentary tradition	159
B. The transposition of mutual recognition instruments	160
C. Problems encountered concerning transposition.....	161
D. Reciprocity and territoriality issues	162
E. Procedures for executing a decision issued in another Member State	162
F. Issues regarding fundamental rights	163
4. Involvement of practitioners, their assessment of MR and practical application	164
A. Involvement of practitioners in negotiations and transposition.....	164
B. Practitioners' general assessment of the mutual recognition instruments.....	164
C. Practical application.....	166
5. Conclusions.....	172

The reception of the principle of mutual recognition in the criminal justice systems of EU Member States. The case of Greece

Valsamis MITSILEGAS	175
1. Introduction.....	175
2. Mutual recognition in criminal matters and the Greek authorities	176
3. The Greek Law on the European Arrest Warrant.....	178
A. Negotiations and issues.....	178
B. The text.....	179
4. Mutual recognition in the Greek Courts	182
A. Methodology and issues.....	182
B. The surrender of own nationals and the Greek Constitution.....	184
5. Conclusion	185

Mutual recognition in criminal matters in Spain.....

Ángeles G. ZARZA	189
1. Introduction.....	189
2. Negotiation of mutual recognition instruments	190
A. General remarks	190
B. Concept and scope of mutual recognition.....	193
C. Concrete examples of the Spanish approach	196
D. Complementary measures to mutual recognition	197

3. Transposition of European instruments into the Spanish legal system	198
A. The transposition process.....	198
B. The instruments implemented.....	201
C. Instruments not yet implemented. Some issues.....	205
4. Interpretation and application of mutual recognition instruments	
by Spanish judicial authorities.....	206
A. Judicial interpretation of the mutual recognition principle	206
B. Fundamental rights and mutual recognition principle	212
C. Useful tools and training on mutual recognition instruments	
for practitioners.....	214
D. Databases and statistical information	215
5. Conclusion	216

The Finnish approach to mutual recognition in criminal matters and its implementation

Annika SUOMINEN	219
1. Introduction.....	219
2. Legislation and national implementation of the mutual recognition instruments.....	220
A. The mutual recognition legislation in Finland.....	220
B. Terminology, especially relating to the Extradition Act.....	221
C. The system of recognition.....	222
3. Specific implementation of certain provisions.....	223
A. The requirement of double criminality	223
B. Provisions on human rights.....	224
C. Provisions on territoriality	226
D. Special conditions with regard to citizens and residents	227
E. Additional amendments of the refusal grounds	228
F. Conclusion on the implementation	229
4. The concept of mutual recognition	229
A. How mutual recognition is understood.....	229
B. Practitioners' understanding and use of mutual recognition.....	231
5. Problems encountered	231
A. Confronted problems	231
B. Conclusion on the problems	237
6. Concluding remarks.....	237

Bilan et perspectives du principe de reconnaissance mutuelle en matière pénale en France

Maiténa POELEMANS	239
1. Introduction. Définition et perception du principe de reconnaissance mutuelle	239
2. Un bilan en demi-teinte de la mise en œuvre du principe de reconnaissance mutuelle	241
A. Une copie « en dégradés » des actes législatifs européens.....	241
B. Une mise en œuvre « en serrés » des dispositions législatives	247

3. Les perspectives en clair-obscur de la mise en œuvre du principe de reconnaissance mutuelle.....	252
A. Une similarité des textes pour des résultats inégaux	252
B. Un renforcement obligé de la confiance mutuelle	254
4. Conclusion	257
The principle of mutual recognition in criminal matters in Hungary	
Katalin LIGETI	259
1. Introduction.....	259
2. The principle of mutual recognition and the Hungarian Constitution	260
A. The principle of mutual recognition and the legality principle	260
B. Surrender of Hungarian nationals	263
3. The implementation of the mutual recognition principle in Hungary	264
A. The limits of the principle of mutual recognition	266
B. Mutual recognition of final judgments and of pre-trial decisions	269
C. The principle of mutual recognition and double criminality	270
D. The application of mutual recognition and procedural safeguards.....	272
E. The principle of mutual recognition and human rights standards	274
F. The principle of mutual recognition and reciprocity	275
4. Practical aspects of the application of the mutual recognition principle	276
A. The Hungarian Ministry of Justice and Law Enforcement as central authority	276
B. The training of practitioners.....	277
C. Information for the general public	277
5. The relationship between mutual recognition and harmonisation	278
6. Conclusions.....	280
Irish practice on mutual recognition of European Union criminal law	
Gerard CONWAY.....	283
1. Introduction.....	283
2. Method and data.....	284
3. Context of Irish criminal law and procedure	285
4. Background to extradition and mutual legal assistance in criminal matters in Irish law.....	286
5. Irish statutory implementation of the European Arrest Warrant	289
A. General.....	289
B. Interpreting the declaration in Irish law	291
C. Interpreting the declaration in EU law	294
D. Amendments to the European Arrest Warrant 2003 Act made by the Criminal Justice (Terrorist Offences) Act 2005.....	295
6. Irish caselaw on the European Arrest Warrant	296
7. The European Evidence Warrant from an Irish perspective	299
A. Background.....	299
B. Changes involved in EEW	299
C. Broader significance of the EEW.....	300

8. Ireland and more recent Third Pillar measures – Criminal Justice (Mutual Assistance) Act 2008	302
9. Ireland, the Treaty on a Constitution for Europe and the Lisbon Treaty	304
10. Conclusions – A summary of challenges and successes of the principle of mutual recognition from an Irish perspective	305
La reconnaissance mutuelle et la mise en œuvre du mandat d’arrêt européen dans l’ordre juridique italien	
Gaetano DE AMICIS	309
1. Le principe de reconnaissance mutuelle dans la perspective de la coopération judiciaire pénale	309
2. La mise en œuvre des instruments de reconnaissance mutuelle dans l’ordre juridique italien : la loi du 22 avril 2005, n° 69, relative au mandat d’arrêt européen	310
3. La « compatibilité » constitutionnelle du MAE.....	311
4. Les points « critiques » de la législation italienne relative au MAE : l’extension de la liste des motifs de refus	312
A. Considérations générales	312
B. L’évaluation des circonstances aggravantes.....	314
C. La documentation « complémentaire ».....	314
D. L’évaluation des « graves indices de culpabilité ».....	315
E. La « résurgence » de la double incrimination	315
F. Les dispositions transitoires.....	317
G. Le rôle de l’autorité centrale.....	317
5. Le fonctionnement de la procédure « passive » de remise : fondements et conditions	318
A. Considérations générales	318
B. Les délais de la procédure d’exécution	319
C. La validation de l’arrestation et l’application des mesures coercitives	320
D. Les délais des mesures provisoires personnelles	322
E. La décision sur l’exécution du MAE.....	323
F. Les voies de recours.....	324
6. Le fonctionnement de la procédure « active » de remise.....	324
A. La compétence pour l’émission du MAE	325
B. Le MAE fondé sur la mesure coercitive de la détention domiciliaire	326
C. L’émission du MAE par rapport aux procédures d’exécution de la peine	326
7. Les principales orientations jurisprudentielles : l’interprétation « corrective » de la Grande Chambre (Sezioni Unite) de la Cour de Cassation.....	327
A. Les indices graves de culpabilité	328
B. La question des limites maximales de la détention provisoire.....	328
C. Les délais pour l’acquisition de la documentation complémentaire	330
D. La question des garanties du « procès équitable ».....	332
E. La remise du citoyen italien	333

F. Vers un principe de proportionnalité dans l'exécution des demandes de remise ?	336
8. Perspectives <i>de iure condendo</i>	337

Future of mutual recognition in criminal matters in the European Union:

Lithuania

Gintaras ŠVEDAS and Darius MICKEVIČIUS	339
1. Introduction.....	339
2. Grounds for refusal, conditions and other limitations restricting the scope of MR.....	343
A. Double criminality	343
B. Nationality of the culprit	346
C. Territoriality clause	347
D. Grounds related to procedural differences	348
E. Human rights clause	349
F. Other "new" grounds for refusal.....	351
3. Procedure	351
4. Future prospects.....	353
A. Issue of proportionality	354
B. Attention to the identity of a suspect.....	355
C. Approximation of laws	355
D. Codification.....	356
E. Non-legislative initiatives	358
F. Principle of MR in the area of administrative offences	358
5. Conclusions.....	358

Les apports de la reconnaissance mutuelle à la coopération judiciaire pénale et ses déficits. Bilan de l'expérience luxembourgeoise

Stefan BRAUM	361
1. Introduction.....	361
2. La mise en œuvre du principe de reconnaissance mutuelle en droit luxembourgeois	362
A. Réalisation et implications des actes législatifs européens	362
B. Inquiétudes de la pratique malgré l'efficacité affichée	364
3. L'impact du principe de RM sur le système national de justice pénale.....	365
A. La reconnaissance mutuelle des décisions judiciaires face à l'examen de la double incrimination	365
B. Un principe confronté à l'harmonisation des législations nationales	367
4. Les difficultés rencontrées dans la pratique de la coopération pénale.....	370
A. Pour le développement de <i>bonnes pratiques</i> en réponse aux défis actuels	370
B. Le mandat d'obtention des preuves, un exemple d'application future de la reconnaissance mutuelle en procédure pénale	372
5. D'une protection européenne des droits fondamentaux.....	377
6. L'ambivalence de la clause de territorialité : motif de refus et source de conflit de juridiction	379

7. Cohérence des instruments de reconnaissance mutuelle	381
8. Conclusions et perspectives	382
Judicial cooperation and mutual recognition in criminal matters in Malta	
Stefano FILLETTI and Alison GATT	385
1. State of play	385
2. Double criminality and territoriality clause	386
A. Double criminality	386
B. Territoriality clause	387
3. Other grounds for refusal	388
A. Mandatory grounds under Maltese law	388
B. Optional grounds	389
C. Additional grounds	390
4. Competent judicial authorities	391
5. Content and form	392
6. Time limits, postponement of execution or temporary surrender	393
A. Time limits	393
B. Postponement of execution or temporary surrender	394
7. Protection of human rights	396
8. Some specific issues related to EAW	397
A. Multiple requests	397
B. Rule of speciality	397
C. Accessory surrender	399
D. Subsequent extradition	399
9. Conclusion	400
The Netherlands and mutual recognition: between proportionality and the rule of law	
Wouter VAN BALLEGOIJ	401
1. Introduction	401
2. General approach towards mutual recognition in the Netherlands	404
A. Ministry	404
B. Prosecutors	405
C. District Court of Amsterdam	406
D. Lawyers	407
3. Limits	407
A. Compliance with the rule of law	408
B. Proportionality	411
4. Harmonisation and practical measures	415
5. Conclusion	416
From EU with trust: the potential and limits of the mutual recognition in the Third Pillar from the Polish perspective	
Adam ŁAZOWSKI	419
1. Introduction	419
2. The European Arrest Warrant and the transposition of the Framework Decision	422

A. From pre-accession approximation to implementation – the first transposition effort	422
B. The constitutional drama.....	426
C. The revision of Art. 55 Polish Constitution and Criminal Procedure Code 1997	432
3. Testing the potential and limits of mutual recognition – the European Arrest Warrant in practice	434
A. General perception of the European Arrest Warrant.....	434
B. Do we like it too much? The (over)use of the EAW by Polish Authorities.....	434
C. Overview of case-law of the Supreme Court and ordinary courts.....	436
D. Conclusions.....	439
4. Beyond the European Arrest Warrant: <i>quo vadis?</i>	440
A. Introduction.....	440
B. The transposition of other Framework Decisions dealing with the mutual recognition	440
C. The general perception of the principle of mutual recognition in criminal matters.....	441
5. Conclusions.....	444
 The Portuguese experience of mutual recognition in criminal matters: five years of European Arrest Warrant	
Pedro CAEIRO and Sónia FIDALGO	445
1. Introduction.....	445
2. The legislative level	446
A. National legal framework: the Portuguese Constitution and Law no. 65/2003 of 23 August 2003.....	446
B. Compliance of Portuguese law with the FD EAW.....	447
3. The judicial level.....	456
A. Mutual recognition as a topic and a ground for judicial decisions	456
B. Case-law on other issues raised by the EAW.....	457
4. Conclusion	463
 Le principe de reconnaissance mutuelle des décisions judiciaires dans l'Union européenne devant les juridictions roumaines. Présent et perspectives	
Florin STRETEANU et Diana IONESCU	465
1. Le cadre législatif national	465
2. L'interprétation du principe de RM en droit interne	468
A. La réglementation du principe de RM dans la loi	468
B. L'approche des magistrats sur le principe de RM	468
C. L'interprétation du principe par la jurisprudence.....	469
3. L'application des dispositions sur le MAE en Roumanie.....	471
A. La compatibilité du MAE avec les dispositions constitutionnelles relatives à l'extradition des citoyens roumains.....	471
B. L'application dans le temps des normes relatives au MAE	472
C. L'autorité judiciaire compétente.....	473

D. La double incrimination du fait	475
E. La clause de territorialité.....	477
F. Les motifs de non-exécution du MAE.....	477
G. Le respect des droits fondamentaux	479
H. Le respect des droits de la défense	482
4. L'application des dispositions concernant les décisions de gel de biens ou d'éléments de preuve	483
5. L'application des dispositions sur la reconnaissance mutuelle des sanctions pécuniaires	484
6. L'application des dispositions sur la reconnaissance mutuelle des décisions de confiscation	485
7. Conclusions.....	486
The approach of Swedish practitioners to the principle of mutual recognition in criminal matters	
Laura SURANO	487
1. Introduction.....	487
2. State of play regarding mutual recognition in criminal matters in Sweden.....	488
A. Legislation implementing EU instruments	488
B. Mutual recognition and mutual trust: the Nordic cooperation model	489
3. Transposition of mutual recognition instruments	490
A. Transposition procedure and competent authorities	490
B. Specific issues related to the EAW.....	492
4. Practical application of the EAW and other judicial cooperation instruments	494
A. EAW: grounds for refusal, dual criminality and supervision instead of detention	494
B. Fundamental rights and procedural guarantees.....	495
C. Transfer of proceedings and conflicts of jurisdiction.....	496
D. Transfer of enforcement of sentence.....	497
E. Admissibility of evidence and approximation of rules regarding evidence gathering. The Swedish experience on Joint Investigation Teams	497
F. Training for practitioners and feedback on application of the EAW	498
5. Conclusions.....	499
Mutual recognition in the context of Slovenian criminal law	
Katja ŠUGMAN STUBBS and Mojca MIHELJ PLESNIČAR	501
1. Introduction.....	501
2. Transposition of mutual recognition instruments	502
A. State of implementation	502
B. Principal problems in transposing the EU instruments.....	507
3. Limits to the principle of mutual recognition, harmonisation and human rights issues	509
A. Final decisions v. pre-trial decisions.....	509
B. Harmonisation of laws	509
C. Criminal law principles and human rights issues.....	511

4. Codification or consolidation of the various instruments based on the mutual recognition principle	513
5. Practical experience with mutual recognition instruments	514
A. The EAW as a model procedure	515
B. Practitioners' point of view	517
C. Practical difficulties	519
D. Limits to the principle and grounds for refusal in practice.....	521
6. Conclusion	522
Mutual recognition of decisions in criminal justice and the United Kingdom	
John R. SPENCER	523
1. Popular attitudes in Britain towards Europe and European criminal law	523
A. The moral superiority of the "common law"	524
B. "Euromyths".....	525
C. "Popular punitivism"	525
D. Euroscepticism, authoritarianism, and the attack on the European Convention.....	526
2. The public reaction in the UK to the <i>Corpus Juris</i> project, and the birth of "mutual recognition"	527
3. The UK's official position in response to EU "mutual recognition" instruments, actual and proposed.....	528
4. The implementation in the United Kingdom of the first four EU "mutual recognition" measures adopted after Tampere.....	530
A. Council Framework Decision 2002/584/JHA of 13 June 2002 on the European arrest warrant and the surrender procedures between Member States	531
B. Council Framework Decision 2003/577/JHA of 22 July 2003 on the execution in the European Union of orders freezing property or evidence.....	536
C. Council Framework Decision 2006/783/JHA of 6 October 2006 on the application of the principle of mutual recognition to confiscation orders.....	537
D. Council Framework Decision 2005/214/JHA of 24 February 2005 on the application of the principle of mutual recognition to financial penalties	539
5. The UK's policy towards mutual recognition in criminal proceedings: a brief evaluation.....	540
6. How well, in practice, is mutual recognition working in the UK?	541
7. The current state of informed opinion in the UK on the future of mutual recognition	543
A. Is "mutual recognition" a good thing, or a bad thing?.....	543
B. "Mutual trust"	543
C. The "dual criminality" issue.....	544
D. The attitude towards possible new "mutual recognition" instruments	545
E. The need for "flanking measures"	547
F. Has mutual recognition reached its limits?	547

G. Would it be desirable to put all the different “mutual recognition” instruments together into one single instrument?	548
Quel futur pour la reconnaissance mutuelle en matière pénale ?	
Analyse transversale	
Gisèle VERNIMMEN-VAN TIGGELEN et Laura SURANO	549
1. Introduction.....	549
2. Bilan de l’acquis	549
A. Où en est-on de la réalisation du programme de reconnaissance mutuelle ?	549
B. Reconnaissance mutuelle et différences de droit substantiel	553
C. Reconnaissance mutuelle et différences de droit procédural	557
D. Reconnaissance mutuelle et différences entre systèmes judiciaires	561
E. Reconnaissance mutuelle et compétence juridictionnelle	562
F. Reconnaissance mutuelle et traitement des nationaux.....	565
G. Questions méthodologiques.....	566
3. Conclusions et propositions pour l’avenir de la reconnaissance mutuelle en matière pénale dans l’UE	569
A. Rapprochement du droit matériel et politique pénale de l’UE	569
B. Droits individuels et garanties procédurales	570
C. Recueil de la preuve : assistance mutuelle et admissibilité	573
D. Conflits de juridiction, <i>non bis in idem</i> et transfert de procédures	575
E. Méthodes de négociation, de transposition, de mise en œuvre et d’évaluation	577
F. Mesures pratiques d’accompagnement : formation et mise en réseau.....	580
List of abbreviations	583
List of contributors	589
Table of contents.....	591