



Universiteit
Leiden
The Netherlands

Migration, abduction and children's rights: the relevance of children's rights and the European supranational system to child abduction cases with immigration components

Florescu, A.S.

Citation

Florescu, A. S. (2025, June 12). *Migration, abduction and children's rights: the relevance of children's rights and the European supranational system to child abduction cases with immigration components*. Meijers-reeks. Retrieved from <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/4249679>

Version: 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/1887/4249679>

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

Migration, Abduction and Children's Rights

The relevance of children's rights and the European supranational system to child abduction cases with immigration components

Migration, Abduction and Children's Rights

The relevance of children's rights and the European supranational system to child abduction cases with immigration components

PROEFSCHRIFT

ter verkrijging van
de graad van doctor aan de Universiteit Leiden,
op gezag van rector magnificus prof.dr.ir. H. Bijl,
volgens besluit van het college voor promoties
te verdedigen op donderdag 12 juni 2025
klokke 16.00 uur

door

Anca Simona Florescu

geboren te Balș, Roemenië

in 1981

Promotores: Prof. dr. T. Liefwaard
Prof. dr. M.R. Bruning

Promotiecommissie: Prof. dr. E. Brems (Ghent Universiteit, België)
Dr. M.A.K. Klaassen
Prof. dr. A.M. Skelton
Prof. dr. I. Sumner (Tilburg Universiteit)

Lay-out: AlphaZet prepress, Bodegraven
Printwerk: Ipskamp Printing

© 2025 A. S. Florescu

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 enig andere manier, zonder voorafgaande schriftelijke toestemming van de auteur.

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

Table of Contents

AKNOWLEDGEMENTS	XI
1 INTRODUCTION	13
1.1 Children in the aftermath of parental separation	13
1.2 Aims and research questions	18
1.3 Research methods	20
1.4 Selection of sources and focus of the research	22
1.5 Limitations	25
1.6 Structure and outline of the chapters	27
1.7 Contribution of the thesis and future questions	30
1.8 Choice of terminology	32
PART I THE CHILDREN'S RIGHTS FRAMEWORK	35
2 BUILDING BLOCKS IN CHILDREN'S RIGHTS	37
2.1 Introduction	37
2.2 Children and parents throughout history	39
2.2.1 Images of childhood	39
2.2.2 Children as subjects of international law	42
2.3 Children, parents and the state within the CRC	48
2.3.1 Standard setting within the CRC	48
2.3.2 The approach under the CRC to the relationship children – parents – state	51
2.4 A rights-based approach to children's rights	56
2.4.1 Choice of terminology: child-centred or rights-based?	56
2.4.2 Substance of a rights-based approach	57
2.4.3 A rights-based approach to judicial decision-making	60
2.5 Conclusions	62
3 CHILDREN'S RIGHTS IN THE AFTERMATH OF PARENTAL SEPARATION	63
3.1 Introduction	63
3.2 The best interests of the child	64
3.2.1 Best interests during the drafting process of the CRC	65
3.2.2 Current relevance	66
3.3 The right of the child to have contact with both parents	70
3.3.1 The right to have contact with both parents during the drafting process of the CRC	71
3.3.2 Current relevance	75
3.4 The right of the child to be heard	80

3.4.1	The right to be heard during the drafting process of the CRC	80
3.4.2	Current relevance	82
3.5	The relationship between the child's best interests, the right to have contact with both parents and the right to be heard	86
3.6	Manifestations of the three rights in post-separation parenting disputes: the parental alienation syndrome	88
3.7	Conclusions	92
PART II	THE CHILD ABDUCTION FRAMEWORK	95
4	PARENTAL CHILD ABDUCTION AND CHILDREN'S RIGHTS	97
4.1	Introduction	97
4.2	Children parents and the state at the drafting stage	99
4.3	The operation of the Child Abduction Convention	100
4.3.1	Policy goals (object and purpose of the Convention)	100
4.3.2	The return mechanism	102
4.3.2.1	Habitual residence	103
4.3.2.2	Custody rights	108
4.3.3	Exceptions to return	109
4.4	Effects of a non-return order. The relationship of the Child Abduction Convention with the 1996 Child Protection Convention	123
4.5	The place of children's rights within the Child Abduction Convention	125
4.5.1	Comity versus human rights	126
4.5.2	Child abduction before the CRC Committee	129
4.5.3	The three core children's rights in the Child Abduction Convention	133
4.6	Conclusions	137
5	CONTEMPORARY DILEMMAS	139
5.1	Introduction	139
5.2	Substantive considerations regarding domestic violence	140
5.2.1	The meaning of domestic violence	140
5.2.2	Domestic violence and children	143
5.3	The relevance of domestic violence for child abduction cases	147
5.3.1	Domestic approaches and academic commentaries	149
5.3.2	The HCCH Guide to Good Practice and the POAM project	152
5.3.3	National legislation implementing the Hague Convention	154
5.4	Separation of the child from the primary carer	154
5.4.1	The change in the profile of the abductor	154
5.4.2	Primary carer abductions: existing approaches and recommendations	157
5.5	Power imbalances; domestic violence and immigration law – substantive considerations	159

5.6	Child abduction and immigration considerations	165
5.6.1	Identification of cases and prevalence of the issue	166
5.6.2	The lack of the relevant immigration permissions to enter, reside and/or work in the country of habitual residence	168
5.6.2.1	Lack of relevant immigration permission to enter the state of habitual residence	169
5.6.2.2	Immigration restrictions affect the taking parent's access to legal employment or other state-related benefits (housing allowance, social benefits, etc)	173
5.6.2.3	The relevance of the distinction primary carer/contact parent	174
5.6.2.4	The HCCH Guide to Good Practice	175
5.6.3	Parental child abduction and (concurrent) asylum claims	175
5.6.3.1	The relationship between The Hague Convention and the Refugee Convention	176
5.6.3.2	The impact of pending asylum claims on Hague Convention proceedings	177
5.6.3.3	Persons subject to return	179
5.6.3.4	Procedural fairness	180
5.7	Conclusions	182
6	PRELIMINARY CONCLUSIONS	183
PART III	THE EUROPEAN SUPRANATIONAL FRAMEWORK	191
7	THE COURT OF JUSTICE OF THE EUROPEAN UNION	193
7.1	Introduction	193
7.2	General considerations: competences, constitutionality, human and children's rights	193
7.2.1	Human rights and private international family law within the EU	194
7.2.2	The Court of Justice of the European Union: competences, nature and human rights	196
7.3	Child abduction in the European Union: The Brussels II <i>ter</i> Regulation	198
7.3.1	Overview	198
7.3.2	The approach of Brussels II <i>ter</i> to the rights of children	202
7.4	Child abduction before the CJEU	205
7.4.1	Overview of cases and selection methods	205
7.4.2	Themes in the CJEU's child abduction case law	205
7.4.3	Children's rights in the CJEU's parental abduction case law	210
7.4.3.1	The best interests of the child	210

7.4.3.2	The right of the child to have contact with both parents: the relevance of children's rights to primary carer abductions	211
7.4.3.3	The right of the child to be protected from violence	214
7.4.3.4	The right to be heard	215
7.5	Conclusions: balancing comity with individual rights	217
8	THE EUROPEAN COURT OF HUMAN RIGHTS	221
8.1	Introduction	221
8.2	General considerations: competences, constitutionality, human and children's rights	222
8.3	Child abduction before the European Court of Human Rights	224
8.3.1	Overview of cases and selection methods	224
8.3.2	Themes in the ECtHR child abduction case law	226
8.3.2.1	Non-enforcement of return orders	226
8.3.2.2	Fairness of the decision-making process: procedural considerations	229
8.3.2.3	The outcome of the proceedings: flawed assessment of key child abduction concepts: habitual residence or custody rights	231
8.3.2.4	The emerging standard of review: a genuine assessment of relevant factors	232
8.3.3	Children's rights in the ECtHR's parental abduction case law	238
8.3.3.1	The Best Interests of the Child	240
8.3.3.2	The right of the child to have contact with both parents: the relevance of children's rights to primary carer abductions	245
8.3.3.3	The right of the child to be protected from violence	253
8.3.3.4	The right to be heard	257
8.4	Conclusions: balancing comity with individual rights	261
9	THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE TWO EUROPEAN SUPRANATIONAL COURTS	265
9.1	Introduction	265
9.2	General Considerations	265
9.2.1	The interaction with the ECHR and the ECtHR from the perspective of the CJEU	266
9.2.2	The interaction with EU law and the CJEU from the perspective of the ECtHR	270
9.3	The relationship between the CJEU and the ECtHR in child abduction cases	273
9.4	Conclusion: children's rights and the intersection between the CJEU and ECtHR in child abduction cases	276

10 THE IMPACT OF THE EUROPEAN SUPRANATIONAL ARCHITECTURE ON PRIMARY CARER ABDUCTIONS WITH IMMIGRATION COMPONENTS	281
10.1 Introduction	281
10.2 The European supranational Courts and the best interests of children from separated parents in immigration proceedings	283
10.2.1 Children of separated parents in the case law of the CJEU	283
10.2.2 Children of separated parents in the case law of the ECtHR	288
10.2.3 Minimum standards in family migration cases: European supranational Courts' case law analysis	294
10.3 The European supranational Courts' relevance for the intersection between child abduction and refugee law	296
10.3.1 The status of the principle of non-refoulement	297
10.3.2 Child abduction proceedings after the receipt of refugee status	298
10.3.3 The recipient of protection	304
10.3.4 The effect of an asylum application	306
10.3.5 Length of the proceedings	308
10.3.6 Burden of proof and evidence necessary of a real risk of harm	310
10.4 Conclusions	311
11 CONCLUSIONS	313
11.1 The first sub-research question: a child rights-based approach to parental child abduction	315
11.1.1 The foundations of a child rights-based approach	315
11.1.2 Applying a child rights framework to parental child abduction	319
11.1.3 Parental child abduction with immigration components: the relevance of children rights	321
11.2 The second sub-research question: The European supranational Courts, child abduction, immigration and children's rights	324
11.2.1 The rights-based approach to child abduction and the European supranational Courts	324
11.2.1.1 A rights-based approach within the European Union	324
11.2.1.2 A rights-based approach before the ECtHR	326
11.2.1.3 The relationship between the two supranational Courts	330
11.2.2 Child abduction with immigration components from the perspective of the European supranational Courts	331
11.2.2.1 Direct impact within child abduction proceedings	331
11.2.2.2 Indirect impact in light of minimum standards of protection	334
11.2.2.3 Parent/child separation and asylum claims	335

11.3 The decision-making framework: a rights-based approach to primary carer abductions with immigration components	337
11.4 Reflections and recommendations	341
BIBLIOGRAPHY	345
SUMMARY	379
SAMENVATTING	385
CURRICULUM VITAE	391

Aknowledgements

A good friend once told me that writing a PhD is like a marathon. It can be completed in one stretch but stopping and resuming makes reaching the finishing line harder. Now that I am at the end of the marathon, and after stopping and resuming so many times I keep thinking of how right she has been.

My PhD journey begun at the Child Law Department of the Leiden University, it continued through Covid times and unemployment through to new professional challenges. The completion of this journey would not have been possible without all the people who cheered me along the way and who pushed me further even when I was almost ready to give up. Ton Liefwaard and Marielle Brunning have always encouraged me to continue; they have gently reminded me that I am almost there, and they have offered invaluable advice and critical reflections to the numerous drafts I have sent. Their continuous support has kept me going and I am deeply grateful for their academic insight and personal engagement. Katrien Klep, my friend and former colleague at Leiden University was there through good and bad, she made me feel heard and understood and she took much of her precious time to read through my drafts and offer excellent suggestions.

This manuscript would not have seen the light of day, had it not been for the understanding of Validity Foundation and their willingness to adjust to long periods of absence on my part. Šárka Dušková and Steven Allen, thank you for facilitating this and for giving me the trust that I can reconcile academic aspirations with international lawyering. My absences increased your workload, they caused additional strain to the organisation, yet you never ceased being flexible and supportive. Sarka, I will always miss our virtual coffees where we debated everything from research to litigation and family life.

Davide, you were the best critic and support person. We made flow charts together, you never stopped asking questions, you called me out for procrastinating. In short you did everything an amazing friend would do. Thank you.

Marja you are a key piece in this puzzle and I am so grateful to have you in my life. Egbert, my original design of research was based on a discussion we had, and even if it ultimately evolved in a different direction, I will always remember this discussion as a starting point for my journey.

It is said that the choice of topic is influenced by personal experience. Being a Romanian immigrant who left the country of origin and lived in three other countries in the past 20 years has certainly left an imprint. I have experienced many cultural differences associated to bringing up children in a

country different than my own. In this journey, I was fortunate to have parents ready to leave their own comfort to spend extended periods of time abroad and help raise the kids while I was in libraries or abroad for research. I was also fortunate to have their model of relationship as a yardstick for my own. My best friends, some of whom left, some of whom stayed kept reminding me that there are more sides to any argument and that there is no topic on which we cannot debate. Andra, Bordi, Olive and Mona, thank you for being unique and for keeping our bond alive despite the distance.

Koen, I am the luckiest person in the world to have you by my side. You never shy away from difficult conversations, and you have shown the incredible capacity to adjust to our family's ever evolving circumstances. Sofia and Noah, I hope that you will understand one day that I had to take so much time from our time together to write this book. This book is for you, Sofia, Noah and Koen.

Simona Florescu,
The Hague, 2025