



Universiteit
Leiden
The Netherlands

EU asylum procedures and the right to an effective remedy

Reneman, A.M.

Citation

Reneman, A. M. (2013, January 15). *EU asylum procedures and the right to an effective remedy*. Meijers-reeks. Retrieved from <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/20403>

Version: Corrected Publisher's Version

License: [Licence agreement concerning inclusion of doctoral thesis in the Institutional Repository of the University of Leiden](#)

Downloaded from: <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/20403>

Note: To cite this publication please use the final published version (if applicable).

Cover Page



Universiteit Leiden



The handle <http://hdl.handle.net/1887/20403> holds various files of this Leiden University dissertation.

Author: Reneman, Anne Marcelle

Title: EU asylum procedures and the right to an effective remedy

Date: 2013-01-15

EU asylum procedures and the right to an effective remedy

EU asylum procedures and the right to an effective remedy

PROEFSCHRIFT

ter verkrijging van
de graad van Doctor aan de Universiteit Leiden,
op gezag van Rector Magnificus prof. mr. P.F. van der Heijden,
volgens besluit van het College voor Promoties
te verdedigen op dinsdag 15 januari 2013
klokke 16.15 uur

door

Anne Marcelle Reneman

geboren te Alkmaar in 1977

Promotiecommissie:

Promotores: prof. mr. P. Boeles
 prof. mr. T.P. Spijkerboer (Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam)

Overige leden: prof. mr. T. Barkhuysen
 prof. mr. H. Battjes (Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam)
 prof. mr. P.R. Rodrigues
 prof. dr. J. Vedsted-Hansen (Aarhus University,
 Denmark)
 prof. mr. R.J.G.M. Widdershoven (Universiteit Utrecht)

Lay-out: Anne-Marie Krens – Tekstbeeld – Oegstgeest

Printed by: Proefschriftmaken.nl – Uitgeverij BOXPress

© 2012 A.M. Reneman

Behoudens de in of krachtens de Auteurswet van 1912 gestelde uitzonderingen mag niets uit deze uitgave worden vervoelvoudigd, opgeslagen in een geautomatiseerd gegevensbestand of openbaar gemaakt, in enige vorm of op enige wijze, hetzij elektronisch, mechanisch, door fotokopieën, opnamen of enige andere manier, zonder voorafgaande schriftelijke toestemming van de uitgever.

Het reprorecht wordt niet uitgeoefend.

No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, made available or communicated to the public, in any form or by any means, without the prior permission in writing of the publisher, unless this is expressly permitted by law.

Acknowledgements

The adventure of writing this book started somewhere in 2006, when I was working as a policy officer for the Dutch Council for Refugees. Upcoming reorganisations urged me to think about my plans for the future. I decided to explore the possibilities to write a PhD thesis. The topic I intended to research, the meaning of the right to an effective remedy for asylum procedures, followed logically from my work for the Dutch Council for Refugees. The previous years I had focused on the Dutch asylum procedure, in particular the problems encountered by asylum applicants and their lawyers in the Netherlands as a result of, amongst others, the 48-hour accelerated procedure, the limited form of judicial review and the strict requirements for new evidence imposed by the case-law of the Council of State. Pieter Boeles' instant enthusiasm about my ideas convinced me that I had chosen the right direction. We agreed that we would try to find funding for a PhD position. Together with Thomas Spijkerboer we submitted an application for the MaGW Open competition of the Netherlands Organisation for Scientific Research (NWO), which was granted. This allowed me to dedicate myself full-time to my PhD research from 1 December 2007.

There are so many things I learned during the process of writing this thesis. Probably most important to me was my discovery of the potential impact of EU law on national asylum procedures. I never imagined that it would be that relevant and inspiring to read EU Courts' judgments concerning competition law, tax law or agricultural policies. It became clear to me that the same procedural questions arise in all kinds of cases, and that EU law provides similar answers to these questions. Hopefully this book will inspire lawyers working in the field of asylum law to use EU law in order to improve procedural guarantees for asylum applicants in Europe.

I am very grateful to my supervisors, Pieter Boeles and Thomas Spijkerboer for their invaluable insights, guidance and support. It was amazing to notice how their comments resulted in great improvements, not only in the content of the research, but also to the readability and accessibility of the text. Their positive criticism and reassurances gave me the energy to review and restructure the chapters of this book time and again.

I would like to thank my colleagues of the Institute of Immigration Law of the Leiden University, Peter Rodrigues, Gerrie Lodder, Maarten den Heijer,

Mark Klaassen, Kees Wouters, Brigitte Straathof, Ciara Smith, Christian Mommers and Suzanne Guèvremont. In our office under the roof of the Law Faculty we had (and still have) many inspired discussions and I have always felt supported in my work. I am very happy that the Institute has survived and is now full of new energy and initiatives.

As a starting lawyer I was privileged to work with so many interesting, inspired and clever people. Thanks to them I developed a passion for asylum law and got the opportunity to grow as a lawyer and as a person. In particular I am grateful to my colleagues of the aliens chamber of the Council of State, the policy unit of the Dutch Council for Refugees, the editorial boards of the *Nieuwsbrief Asiel- and Vluchtelingenrecht* and *Asiel & Migrantenrecht*, the Advisory Committee of the Dutch Council for Refugees and the Meijers Committee.

I found an invaluable sparring partner in René Bruin. Thank you for always being there to read and discuss the annotations or articles I wrote. Dana Baldinger, Karen Geertsema and Hannah Helmink, I really enjoyed the many interesting meetings we had on procedural topics and your feedback on several chapters of this book was very useful.

I am grateful to the members of the PhD committee, professors Tom Barkhuysen, Hemme Battjes, Peter Rodrigues, Jens Vedsted-Hansen and Rob Widdershoven, for reviewing the manuscript and providing useful feedback.

Finally I want to thank my family and friends for their support, encouragements and confidence. Mama, papa, Lotte, thanks for being there for me during all the ups and downs. And then of course my dearest three men, Gilles, Yves and Xavier, you are the ones I always long to come home to.

August 2012

Table of contents

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

XIII

1	INTRODUCTION: IN SEARCH OF EU STANDARDS FOR ASYLUM PROCEDURES	1
1.1	Adequate and fair asylum procedures in the EU: State of the art	1
1.2	In search of EU standards for asylum procedures	8
1.2.1	Protection of fundamental rights in the EU legal order	8
1.2.2	Scope of application of the Charter and general principles of EU law	11
1.2.3	Function of EU fundamental rights and general principles	13
1.2.4	Sources of Inspiration of EU fundamental rights and general principles	14
1.3	Research goal and questions	18
1.3.1	Preliminary issues (Part I)	18
1.3.2	Key issues of asylum procedures (Part II)	20
1.3.3	Conclusions (Part III)	21
1.4	Step wise approach	21
1.4.1	The method of selecting research material	22
1.5	Scope and limitations of the study	24
	 PART I – Preliminary issues	 29
2	THE COMMON EUROPEAN ASYLUM SYSTEM AND THE APPLICABILITY OF EU PROCEDURAL STANDARDS	31
2.1	The Common European Asylum System and its legal basis	32
2.1.1	Legal basis of EU asylum legislation	32
2.1.2	Policy framework: the Common European Asylum System	33
2.2	The Procedures Directive	36
2.2.1	Scope of application	38
2.2.2	Overview of the directive's provisions	39
2.2.3	Low level of harmonisation and wide discretion	40
2.3	The Qualification Directive	41
2.3.1	Scope of application	42
2.3.2	Overview of the directive's provisions	42
2.4	Applicability of EU fundamental rights	43
2.4.1	Testing the legality of minimum standards	43
2.4.2	Interpreting and filling in gaps in EU asylum legislation	46

2.5	The role of national courts and the Court of Justice	47
2.5.1	Legality review of EU legislation	48
2.5.2	Interpretation of EU law	49
2.5.3	The important role of the national courts as EU courts	50
3	INTERNATIONAL TREATIES AS SOURCES OF INSPIRATION FOR EU FUNDAMENTAL RIGHTS	53
3.1	International rights versus EU fundamental rights	54
3.1.1	May EU fundamental rights provide a lower level of protection?	54
3.1.2	May EU fundamental rights provide broader protection?	56
3.2	International treaties and the Common European Asylum System	56
3.2.1	The European Convention on Human Rights	57
3.2.2	The Refugee Convention	58
3.2.3	The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights	59
3.2.4	The UN Convention against Torture	59
3.2.5	The UN Convention on the Rights of the Child	60
3.2.6	Direct application of international treaties?	61
3.3	The weight of international treaties in the case-law of the Court of Justice	62
3.3.1	The ECtHR's judgments	64
3.3.2	Council of Europe documents	68
3.3.3	UNHCR documents and Excom Conclusions	69
3.3.4	The views of the UN Committees	70
3.3.5	Should non-binding documents be taken into account?	72
3.4	The relative weight of international treaties as sources of inspiration	74
4	THE EU RIGHT TO AN EFFECTIVE REMEDY AND RELATED PROCEDURAL RIGHTS AND PRINCIPLES	77
4.1	Limitations to the procedural autonomy of the Member States	78
4.2	The link between EU procedural rights and principles	81
4.3	The EU right to an effective remedy	86
4.3.1	Provisions of international law inspiring the EU right to an effective remedy	87
4.3.2	Application to asylum cases	91
4.3.3	Effectiveness	93
4.3.4	Institutions responsible for providing effective remedies	95
4.3.5	Effect in the national legal order	97
4.3.6	The right of access to a court or tribunal	98
4.3.7	The right to equality of arms and adversarial proceedings	99
4.4	The EU right to good administration	101
4.4.1	Provisions of international law inspiring the EU right to good administration	102
4.4.2	The right to be heard	103
4.4.3	The duty to state reasons	105

4.5	Three basic notions	108
4.5.1	Balancing of interests	108
4.5.2	Assessing the overall fairness of a procedure	110
4.5.3	The subject matter of the procedure	113
4.5.3.1	The nature of the rights claimed	113
4.5.3.2	Special vulnerability of the persons concerned	115
5	PRELIMINARY CONCLUSIONS AND METHODOLOGY USED FOR THE FOLLOWING CHAPTERS	119
5.1	Method for defining the meaning of the EU right to an effective remedy	120
	 PART II – Key issues of asylum procedures	 123
6	THE RIGHT TO REMAIN ON THE TERRITORY OF THE MEMBER STATES	125
6.1	The right to remain during the examination of the asylum claim	126
6.2	The right to remain during the time necessary to lodge the appeal	129
6.3	The right to remain during appeal proceedings	131
6.3.1	The right to interim protection	133
6.3.1.1	The Court of Justice’s case-law	133
6.3.1.2	Obligations stemming from the ECHR, ICCPR, CAT and Refugee Convention	139
6.3.1.3	Subconclusion: the right to interim protection	144
6.3.2	The meaning of automatic suspensive effect	146
6.3.2.1	The Court of Justice’s case-law	147
6.3.2.2	Obligations stemming from the ECHR	148
6.3.2.3	Subconclusion: the meaning of automatic suspensive effect	150
6.4	Synthesis of findings	151
7	THE ASYLUM APPLICANT’S RIGHT TO BE HEARD ON HIS ASYLUM MOTIVES	153
7.1	The right to a personal interview in first instance proceedings	155
7.1.1	Dependent adults	160
7.1.2	Accompanied and unaccompanied minor asylum applicants	161
7.2	Requirements as to the conduct of the interview	166
7.2.1	Language of the interview	167
7.2.2	The right to a free and competent interpreter	168
7.2.3	The competence of the interviewer	170
7.2.4	Gender-sensitive interviews	171
7.2.5	Child-friendly interviews	172
7.3	The asylum applicant’s right to be heard following the personal interview	175
7.3.1	The right to comment on the report of the interview	178
7.3.2	The right to comment on the fact-finding and risk assessment	180
7.4	The right to an oral hearing before a court or tribunal	185
7.5	Synthesis of findings	185

8	THE BURDEN AND STANDARD OF PROOF AND EVIDENTIARY ASSESSMENT	189
8.1	The standard of proof: what needs to be proved	191
8.2	The burden of proof: who needs to make plausible?	201
8.2.1	Adducing evidence and dispelling doubts	202
8.2.2	Produding evidence: a shared duty	209
8.3	Individual assessment and the use of presumptions	214
8.4	Assessing the credibility of the applicant's statements	219
8.5	Evidentiary assessment	233
8.5.1	Expert reports	239
8.5.2	Country of origin information reports	242
8.5.3	Medical evidence	247
8.6	Synthesis of findings	251
9	JUDICIAL REVIEW AND ESTABLISHMENT AND QUALIFICATION OF THE FACTS	257
9.1	Limitation of judicial review to points of law?	258
9.1.1	The Court of Justice's case-law	259
9.1.2	Obligations stemming from the ECHR, CAT and ICCPR	260
9.1.3	Subconclusion: limitation of judicial review to points of law?	262
9.2	Thorough review of the assessment of the facts	263
9.2.1	The EU Court's case-law	265
9.2.2	Obligations stemming from the ECHR, CAT and ICCPR	275
9.2.2.1	Intensity of judicial review under the right to an effective remedy	277
9.2.2.2	The subsidiary role of the ECtHR, ComAT and HRC in asylum cases	281
9.2.2.3	The right to a fair trial	289
9.2.3	Subconclusion: thorough review of the assessment of the facts	292
9.3	The relevant moment in time: <i>ex tunc</i> or <i>ex nunc</i> review?	294
9.3.1	The Court of Justice's case-law	296
9.3.2	Obligations stemming from the ECHR, CAT and ICCPR	298
9.3.3	Subconclusion: the relevant moment in time	300
9.4	Synthesis of findings	300
10	THE USE OF SECRET INFORMATION IN ASYLUM CASES	303
10.1	The use of secret information under EU law	305
10.1.1	Competition cases and the protection of business secrets	308
10.1.1.1	The right of access to the file	309
10.1.1.2	The right to confidentiality	313
10.1.1.3	Confidentiality versus access to the file	315
10.1.1.4	Judicial review	318
10.1.1.5	Subconclusion: the use of secret information in EU competition cases	323
10.1.2	EU sanctions and the protection of national security	324
10.1.2.1	Legal framework and scope of judicial review	325
10.1.2.2	The right to be heard	329

10.1.2.3 The obligation to state reasons	334
10.1.2.4 The right to an effective remedy	339
10.1.2.5 Subconclusion: the use of secret information in EU sanction cases	343
10.2 The use of secret information under international law	344
10.2.1 The ECtHR's case-law on secret evidence	347
10.2.2 The right of adversarial proceedings: level of protection	350
10.2.3 Limitations of the right of adversarial proceedings	354
10.2.4 Confidentiality versus adversarial proceedings	361
10.2.5 Subconclusion: the use of secret information under international law	371
10.3 Synthesis of findings	373
 PART III – Conclusions	 379
11 TOWARDS A COMMON AND FAIR EUROPEAN ASYLUM PROCEDURE?	381
11.1 EU procedural law: common principles, specific applications	382
11.1.1 Common procedural principles	382
11.1.2 Specific applications: the three basis notions	384
11.1.2.1 Balancing of interests	384
11.1.2.2 The overall fairness of the procedure	385
11.1.2.3 The subject matter of the procedure	386
11.1.3 Wider applicability of the methodology	388
11.2 The Procedures Directive: ugly creature or important step forward?	389
11.2.1 The Procedures Directive's potential	391
11.2.2 Broader protection than the ECHR	392
11.2.3 Supervision and practical support for the Member States	394
11.2.4 Subconclusion: the Procedures Directive, an important step forward	395
11.3 A set of EU procedural standards for asylum procedures	395
11.4 Enforcing the EU right to an effective remedy in practice	400
11.4.1 Incorporating case-law in EU legislation: the recast of the Procedures Directive	401
11.5 The recasts of the Procedures Directive and Qualification Directive put to the test	402
11.5.1 The proposals for a recast of the Procedures Directive	403
11.5.2 The recast of the Qualification Directive	405
11.5.3 The right to remain on the territory of the Member State	405
11.5.4 The asylum applicant's right to be heard on his asylum motives	407
11.5.5 The burden and standard of proof and evidentiary assessment	410
11.5.6 Judicial review of the establishment and qualification of the facts	412
11.5.7 The use of secret information in asylum cases	412
11.5.8 Subconclusion: the recasts put to the test	413
11.6 Towards fair asylum procedures in Europe	414

SAMENVATTING	415
BIBLIOGRAPHY	427
TABLE OF CASES	435
INDEX	449
CURRICULUM VITAE	455

List of abbreviations

Adm	admissibility decision
A.G.	Advocate-General
CAT	United Nations Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment
CEAS	Common European Asylum System
CEDAW	Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women
CFI	Court of First Instance
Charter	Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union
CRC	United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child
ComAT	Committee against Torture
ComRC	Committee on the Rights of the Child
EASO	European Asylum Support Office
EC	European Community
EC Treaty	Treaty establishing the European Community
ECHR	European Convention on Human Rights
ECtHR	European Court of Human Rights
EComHR	European Commission of Human Rights
EEA	European Economic Area
EU	European Union
EXCOM	Executive Committee of the Programme of the High Commissioner
GC	Grand Chamber (European Court of Human Rights)
HRC	Human Rights Committee
ICCPR	International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights
ICERD	International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination
PD	Procedures Directive (2005/85/EC)
Plen	plenary session
RCD	Reception Conditions Directive (2003/9/EC)
RD	Return Directive (2008/115/EC)
SIAC	Special Immigration Appeal Commission
TEU	Treaty on European Union
TfEU	Treaty on the functioning of the European Union
TPD	Temporary Protection Directive (2001/55/EC)
UN	United Nations
UNHCR	United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees
UNWRA	United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees
QD	Qualification Directive (2004/83/EC)

