

European Update – June 2010

Dublin returns to Greece: a further update

In the last European Update, we outlined the continued litigation relating to the Dublin transfers to Greece. Since then, there have been further developments in the litigation in the UK, other European States and the European Court of Human Rights.

UK Litigation: R (Saeedi) v Secretary of State for the Home Department & Ors [2010] EWHC 705 (Admin)

On 31 March, the Administrative Court gave judgment in Saeedi. This case examined the lawfulness of certificates made by the Secretary of State under Schedule 3 of the Asylum and Immigration (Treatment of Claimants etc) Act 2004 for the purpose of returns to Greece from the UK under the Dublin Regulation and the scope of discretion in Article 3(2) of the Dublin Regulation (the “sovereignty clause”). Amnesty International, the AIRE Centre and UNHCR intervened. It is understood that Dublin transfers from the UK to Greece are currently suspended as a result of this litigation.

Saeedi argued that his return to Greece under the Dublin Regulation would breach the UK’s obligations under Article 3 ECHR. He is an Afghan national who fled his country when the Afghan authorities discovered he had converted to Christianity. Saeedi was detained twice in Greece before traveling through other EU countries to the UK, where he claimed asylum. In April 2009 the UK authorities informed him that he would be returned to Greece under the Dublin Regulation as a fingerprint match on the Eurodac database revealed he had been. Greece was deemed to have accepted responsibility for examining his claim for asylum by default as they had failed to respond to the UK’s request within the prescribed time limits.

Cranston, J considered Saeedi’s threefold submission. Firstly, that the Secretary of State was wrong in certifying his claim that returning him to Greece would breach Article 3 ECHR as clearly unfounded. Secondly, that it was incompatible with the UK’s obligations under Article 3 ECHR to automatically consider Greece a “safe third country” from which he would not be *refouled*. Thirdly, the Secretary of State should apply his discretion in applying the responsibility sharing mechanism under the Dublin Regulation in light of the rights and safeguards contained in wider EU law.

The Administrative Court’s approach to Saeedi’s submissions was to consider whether the position of Dublin returnees to Greece were in a worse position since the House of Lords’ decision in Nasseri¹. In that case, the House of Lords had found that

¹ [2010] 1 AC 1

there was no evidence showing that there was a real risk that returnees to Greece would be sent back to another country in breach of Article 3 ECHR and that the provisions of UK law that prohibited the consideration of that issue in respect of listed countries was not incompatible with the UK's obligations under the ECHR.

The Court dismissed the application without considering it was necessary to make a reference to the European Court of Justice. However, the Court granted permission to appeal to the Court of Appeal to the applicant.

The lengthy judgment can be summarized in relation to the Court's findings in respect of the applicant's principle arguments.

Article 3: Refoulement and Prison Conditions

Cranston, J concluded that there was evidence that some Afghan asylum seekers had been returned from Greece to Afghanistan but he found that these returns were voluntary as Saeedi was unable to show evidence to the contrary. He also concluded that the evidence did not show circumstances materially different from Nasseri and KRS v UK² because, although it was reported that there were complaints of *refoulement* from Greece to Turkey, none of these were Dublin returnees and the Greek authorities had given assurances that no Dublin returnees would be sent to the border area with Turkey or sent to Turkey.

Therefore, Cranston, J refused to quash the certificate issued against Saeedi that his human rights claim to Greece was clearly unfounded because on anxious scrutiny he found that there were not substantial grounds for believing that return to Greece would expose Saeedi to a real risk of being subject to treatment contrary to Article 3 ECHR. He clarified that the evidence of a risk of detention for Dublin returnees was too speculative to create substantial grounds for believing that there is a real risk of detention in conditions that breach Article 3 ECHR.

Further, Cranston, J refused to declare the provision of Schedule 3 of the Asylum and Immigration (Treatment of Claimants etc) Act 2004 incompatible with Article 3 ECHR by applying the House of Lords' decision in Nasseri which had relied on KRS. He also agreed with the House of Lords in Nasseri that there was a presumption that Greece met its obligations under the ECHR and the Refugee Convention.

Article 3: Asylum Procedures and Conditions

In terms of asylum procedures in Greece, Cranston, J found that they remained "shaky" as described Laws, LJ in the Court of Appeal's decision in Nasseri. Dublin returnees may not have a meaningful access to the asylum determination procedure and that they might be served with deportation order without being able to pursue their claims. However, the Judge found that the situation was not materially different from the findings in KRS and Nasseri and that therefore return of Saeedi to Greece would not breach Article 3 ECHR.

Cranston, J adopted the same approach and findings in relation to conditions on return

² (Application no 32733/08), 2 December 2008. European Court of Human Rights

to Greece. Despite labeling the conditions for asylum seekers in Greece as “appalling”, he found that they are not materially worse than when the courts examined the cases of KRS and Nasseri. He relied on the House of Lords decisions in Limbuela³ to conclude that “the failure of the Greek Government to provide the means of subsistence does not amount to a breach of Article 3 by the Secretary of State in this type of expulsion case”. This was because the destitution cannot be said to be the responsibility of the UK government due to the weak link between destitution in the receiving state and transfers to Greece under the Dublin Regulation by the UK.

The “Sovereignty Clause” in the Dublin Regulation

Cranston J referred to the recent decision of the Court of Justice in Abdulla⁴ in finding that Article 3(2) of the Dublin Regulation must be interpreted and applied in the context of the Common European Asylum System (CEAS) and of fundamental rights contained in the EU Charter. He then went on to hold that there is nothing in the Dublin Regulation that compels States to use Article 3(2) to examine the substantive rights of persons falling within the Regulation because some aspects of the CEAS are not fully observed in other Member States. He said this would be contrary to the purpose of the Dublin Regulation which sought to share responsibility, avoid “asylum shopping” and ensure swift decisions on responsibility. He did note, however, that the discretion clause of Article 3(2) should be exercised taking into account the rights enshrined in the EU Charter of Fundamental Rights, but held that as a result of the UK and Polish Protocol to the Charter, the relevant rights could not be enforced directly against the Secretary of State. The failure of the Secretary of State to take those rights into account in Saeedi’s case was academic as a result the Court’s conclusions in respect of the other human rights arguments, the applicant’s resourcefulness and the fact that he did not fall into a category of vulnerability.

Next Steps in the litigation

The applicant’s lawyers⁵ have indicated that the Court of Appeal will hear the Saeedi’s appeal in mid July. The Equality and Human Rights Commission is seeking to be an additional intervener on the legal issues relating to the EU Charter.

Litigation in other Member States

Litigation on Dublin transfers to Greece continues in other states. For example, in the High Court of Ireland, 5 linked cases are due to be heard on 22 and 23 June, in which similar legal arguments to those considered in Saeedi will be heard. Amnesty International and the AIRE Centre have been admitted as amici curiae⁶. There is a possibility that the Court will make a reference to the Court of Justice.

³ [2005] UKHL 66

⁴ Abdulla C-175/08, C-176/08, C-178/08 and C-179/08

⁵ The applicant is represented by RoopaTanna at Refugee and Migrant Justice instructing Mark Henderson and Alison Pickup of Doughty Street Chambers.

⁶ Edris [2010 No 131 JR] and Mohamed [2010 No. 177 JR] and Pooladrak [2010 No. 337 JR] and Tamersit [2010 No 184 JR] and Kabir [2010 No. 526 JR] v Refugee Appeals Commissioner and the Minister for Justice Equality and Law Reform. We are grateful to Adam Weiss at the AIRE Centre for this information.

The Federal Constitutional Court in Germany has recently suspended the transfer of 2 Syrian asylum seekers to Greece⁷ and, according to ECRE, is expected to rule on a lead case soon. ECRE have also recently passed on news that, on 20 May, the French Conseil d'Etat ruled that a Palestinian family's transfer to Greece should be temporarily suspended on the basis that they had not be able to exercise their fundamental right to asylum when in Greece⁸.

Litigation in the European Court of Human Rights

As predicted in the last note on this issue, the case of MSS v Belgium and Greece⁹ has been relinquished to the Grand Chamber. It will be heard on 1 September. Numerous interventions have been made including by UNHCR, the AIRE Centre, Amnesty International, Refugee and Migrant Justice and the Greek Helsinki Monitor.

Applications to the Court for indications under Rule 39 continue to be granted in some, but not all, cases. There are over 100 such indications in cases where it is proposed to transfer the applicant from Finland to Greece. Last week, the Third Section of the Court gave a reasoned indication that requested the Dutch government to refrain from transferring a number of Somali cases to Greece¹⁰.

Christen Querton and Nick Oakeshott
Asylum Aid

⁷See [www.asyl.net/index.php?id=185&tx_ttnews\[tt_news\]=39369&cHash=cce6b2097c](http://www.asyl.net/index.php?id=185&tx_ttnews[tt_news]=39369&cHash=cce6b2097c)

⁸ Othman Nos 339478 and 339479 (Judgment and English summary on file at Asylum Aid)

⁹ Application No 30696/09, once again we are grateful to Adam Weiss at the AIRE Centre for this information.

¹⁰ We are grateful to Sadhia Rafi and Lara Talsma at the Dutch Council for Refugees for this information

Response to the European Commission’s consultation on ‘EU Citizens’ Rights – The Way Forward’

1. The AIRE Centre (Advice on Individual Rights in Europe) and ILPA (the Immigration Law Practitioners Association) submit these comments in response to the European Commission’s consultation on ‘EU Citizens’ Rights – The Way Forward’.

I. Who We Are

2. The AIRE Centre is a London-based charity whose mission is to promote awareness of European law rights and assist marginalised individuals and those in vulnerable circumstances to assert those rights. The Centre provides, among other things, specialist free written legal advice to EU citizens and their family members in the UK on their rights under EU law on the free movement of persons. Usually we provide this advice on a second-tier basis; that is, other voluntary-sector advice centres come to us with complex questions about the rights of their clients and we respond in writing, to enable them to help their clients get residence documentation or benefits, for example, or to make decisions to improve their situation. The primary issues the Centre advises on in this area are access to social assistance and social security benefits, residence rights, and labour-market access for accession nationals. In 2009, for example, we provided expert written advice on EU free-movement law in response to 303 requests.
3. The Immigration Law Practitioners’ Association (ILPA) is a professional association with some 900 members (individuals and organisations), the majority of whom are barristers, solicitors and advocates practising in all aspects of immigration, asylum and nationality law. Academics, non-governmental organisations and individuals with an interest in the law are also members. Established over 25 years ago, ILPA exists to promote and improve advice and representation in immigration, asylum and nationality law, through an extensive programme of training and disseminating information and by providing evidence-based research and opinion. ILPA is represented on numerous Government, including UK Border Agency and other ‘stakeholder’ and advisory groups.

II. What We Are Writing About

4. These comments respond to the third ‘key question’ found in the consultation document: ‘*What are the main obstacles faced by European Union citizens when moving to or residing in another EU country? What could be done to remove these obstacles and enhance this right?*’ The focus is on obstacles facing those already residing in another EU country, using the UK as an example¹¹.
5. The aim of these comments is to provide the Commission with information about the obstacles vulnerable and marginalised EU migrants face – with a particular emphasis on women, minorities, those on low incomes and persons with disabilities, when residing in the United Kingdom. It is true, as the consultation paper says, that EU citizens ‘*use transport services, buy products or book hotels on the Internet, watch cross-border TV channels in the hotel, consume leisure services in other EU countries, use real-estate agency services if they decide to buy a summer house in another EU country, use financial services and health care services, etc.*’. That ‘etc.’, though, covers a lot: EU migrants in the UK (as elsewhere in Europe) also face destitution and come to depend on the assistance of charities; many become pregnant and are unable to access social assistance benefits made available to British Citizens; some are victims of domestic violence but likewise are turned away from essential State services; others are victims of human trafficking and/or exploitation who find themselves unable to access effective remedies for the human rights violations they have suffered in the UK; many have developed drug and alcohol abuse problems and require social and medical assistance they have difficulty accessing. Many of the EU migrants the AIRE Centre and ILPA have come into contact with did not simply come to the UK for a better life, but more specifically to escape discrimination, violence (within the family or otherwise), or poverty in the Member State they come from.
6. Like other EU migrants, these people face two related problems:
 - a. the authorities do not respect the rights they have under EU law; and/or
 - b. their rights under EU law in certain respects are not clear.

¹¹ According to the most recent statistics available (the Eurostat statistics from 2008 cited in the consultation paper), the UK is the third-largest recipient of EU migrants in the Union, after Spain and Germany. The UK is probably the second or first largest recipient of migrant EU workers and self-employed persons. Since the waves of accession in 2004 and 2007, the UK has seen a large number of migrants from the new central and east European countries in particular.

7. Unlike many other EU migrants, these people have much more difficulty bringing their situation to the attention of the European institutions. They are also much less likely to engage in the protracted legal proceedings necessary to resolve their problems.
8. The major obstacle to these migrants' exercise of their free-movement rights is the failure to respect the rule of law: the State either violates EU law or systematically construes ambiguities in EU law in ways unfavourable to EU migrants (particularly those in vulnerable groups). We have identified four obstacles which are essentially manifestations of this rule-of-law problem:
 - a. administrative obstruction;
 - b. legislative and institutional barriers to social assistance and social security;
 - c. inadequate response to the exploitation of EU migrant workers; and
 - d. disregard for and confusion about the rights of EU migrant prisoners and their families.
9. These categories are interrelated (and in some respects the last three are simply examples of the first).
10. We address these four obstacles in the next part and then offer recommendations to the Commission.

III. The Obstacles

a. Administrative Obstruction

11. By 'administrative obstruction' the AIRE Centre and ILPA mean acts or omissions of the administration which fail to observe procedural or substantive legal guarantees and which result from ignorance of the law, carelessness and/or expediency. Administrative obstruction slows down the exercise of free-movement rights and imposes a cost on the EU citizen who asserts her rights before unwilling and/or unhelpful administrative authorities.
12. In the UK, administrative obstruction is legion. The AIRE Centre and ILPA have made the Commission aware of the problems with the UK Border Agency ('UKBA' or 'the Agency'), the centralised agency responsible for all decision-making in matters concerning residence rights and residence documentation. The principal feature of UKBA's administrative obstruction in relation to EU migrants is delay; the Agency regularly violates the time limits set out in Directive 2004/38 (see, e.g., Article 8(1) and Article 19(2)).

In many cases where UKBA does not believe an EU national is entitled to documentation on substantive grounds (e.g. where they believe that an individual has not resided legally in the UK for five continuous years because she was a jobseeker for an extended period of time), they return the application as ‘incomplete’ instead of taking a decision which could be appealed (in violation of Article 15(1)). The Agency has also refused to take the necessary action to amend administrative regulations that violate EU law (see, e.g., Regulation 12(1)(b) of the Immigration (European Economic Area) Regulations 2006, rendered unlawful by Case C-127/08 *Metock v Minister for Justice, Equality and Law Reform* two years ago).

13. Administrative obstruction in the distribution of social assistance and social security benefits is linked to the UK’s decentralised benefits administration, who are untrained on basic matters of EU law and, it often appears, incentivised to refuse benefits to migrants. Government departments do not notify those on the front line of changes in EU law (such as the recent Case C-480/08 *Teixeira v London Borough of Lambeth* about social assistance benefits for the EU national primary carer of a child in education of an EU worker); in a recent case an AIRE Centre client was told by a benefits officer that the decision could not be applied in her favour because the officer had not yet received formal guidance from the Department of Work and Pensions on how to apply it.
14. The consequences for vulnerable groups of migrants in the UK can be dramatic. The AIRE Centre and ILPA have seen, the following, for example:
 - a. EU migrant women who are victims of domestic violence, who have clearly resided in the UK for over five years, are frequently refused documentation confirming their permanent residence because they cannot meet onerous evidentiary requirements. Even though the UK authorities have access to the necessary information (e.g. evidence of the EU migrant’s work or her spouse’s through tax and National Insurance records), and even though ‘[t]he **burden of proof** lies on the authorities of the Member States when restricting rights under the Directive’ (COM(2009) 313 final, paragraph 4.2, emphasis in original), the authorities refuse to acknowledge permanent residence. Even when they do, it is often many months after the applications are made.

Without documentation, these women are refused vital State services such as housing and benefits and are left homeless.


- b. Low-income EU migrants, when applying for permanent residence cards, are forced to produce non-existent evidence (e.g. because they do not have bank accounts, notoriously difficult for migrants to open) that they had sufficient funds to avoid being a burden on the social assistance system during periods when they were economically inactive.
- c. Students on low-incomes from Romania and Bulgaria are refused registration certificates as students because they cannot prove they have comprehensive sickness insurance, when they are entitled to comprehensive health cover under the National Health Service as a matter of domestic law. As a result of the refusal, they cannot exercise their right to work 20 hours per week in the UK, guaranteed by domestic law (in line with the rights of third-country national students).
- d. EU migrants of minority race or ethnicity are treated as ‘not European’ and therefore not entitled to benefits by certain benefits officers. Some former refugees the AIRE Centre has advised, who have naturalised in their country of refuge in the European Union then moved to the UK in exercise of their free movement rights, have been in particular encouraged to return back to the country that ‘took them in’ when they are entitled to reside in the UK and are in fact entitled to benefits.

15. The unlawful refusal to grant residence documentation or social assistance benefits is a human rights issue. See, e.g., Aristimuño Mendizabal v France (European Court of Human Rights, judgment (2006), refusal to grant residence documentation under EU law to Spanish national in France a violation of Article 8 ECHR); Stec and others v United Kingdom (European Court of Human Rights, Grand Chamber, decision (2005), finding non-contributory benefits fall within the scope of Article 1 of Protocol 1 ECHR). The administrative obstruction that causes it is a major obstacle to the exercise of free-movement rights of EU migrants in the UK

b. Legislative and Institutional Barriers to Social Assistance and Social Security


16. The AIRE Centre and ILPA have had extensive correspondence with the Commission about problems with accessing welfare benefits in the UK (attached here). The Commission has already concluded that several aspects of UK policy are unlawful. Without revisiting those specific issues (which we nonetheless hope will be considered alongside these comments as part of the consultation), it is possible to draw an abstract picture of the problem.
17. The AIRE Centre and ILPA appreciate that the Directive does not permit ‘social tourism’ (Case C-456/02 Trojani v Centre public d’aide sociale de Bruxelles, opinion of Advocate General Geelhoed, paragraph 18). However, as we understand it the Directive does envisage at least temporary non-discriminatory access to the social assistance system for those EU migrants who have been exercising residence rights under Article 7(1) of the Directive. That understanding is based on:
- a. Recital (16) to the Directive: *‘As long as the beneficiaries of the right of residence do not become an unreasonable burden on the social assistance system of the host Member State they should not be expelled. Therefore, an expulsion measure should not be an automatic consequence of recourse to the social assistance system’*. (emphasis added)
 - b. Article 14(2), second paragraph: *‘In specific cases where there is a reasonable doubt as to whether a Union citizen or his/her family members satisfies the conditions set out in Article 7, 12 and 13, Member States may verify if these conditions are fulfilled. This verification shall not be carried out systematically.’* (emphasis added)
 - c. Article 14(3): *‘An expulsion measure shall not be the automatic consequence of a Union citizen’s or his or her family member’s recourse to the social assistance system of the host Member State.’* (emphasis added)
 - d. Article 24(1): *‘Subject to such specific provisions as are expressly provided for in the Treaty and secondary law, all Union citizens residing on the basis of this Directive in the territory of the host Member State shall enjoy equal treatment with the nationals of the Member State within the scope of the Treaty.’* (emphasis added)

18. For those individuals who have been exercising residence rights under Article 7(1)(a), (b), (c) and/or (d), the Directive implies that they will automatically be granted non-discriminatory access to the social assistance system: to check systematically that they have maintained residence rights at that stage would violate the Article 14(2) prohibition on systematic verification. It would also deprive the other provisions cited above of meaning: if an individual who has been exercising residence rights in the host Member State could not access the social assistance system, at least temporarily, why bother emphasising that an expulsion measure shall not be the automatic consequence of having recourse to that system, or that individuals shall not become an unreasonable burden? These provisions clearly do not only refer to those who have been exercising residence rights jobseekers, workers or the self-employed – they benefit from a further, absolute exemption from expulsion (Article 14(4)).
19. It might be said that the Directive envisages the following scenario in relation to social assistance:



20. The UK operates a different system. For certain very basic forms of social assistance for the most vulnerable, EU migrants are specifically excluded by primary legislation in all cases, unless, ‘*and to the extent that*’, provision ‘*is necessary for the purpose of avoiding a breach of (a) a person’s Convention [i.e. ECHR] rights, or (b) a person’s rights under the Community Treaties*’. Nationality, Immigration and Asylum Act 2002, Schedule 3 paragraph 3. For other forms of social assistance individuals must pass the right-to-reside test. See, e.g., The Social Security (Persons from Abroad) (Amendment) Regulations 2006 or The Allocation of Housing and Homelessness (Eligibility) (England) Regulations 2006. Whatever residence documentation an EU migrant who presents at a benefits office may have is irrelevant: she

must prove at the time of application that she is currently a worker, self-employed or the family member of such a person. (And in many cases, due to administrative obstruction, even clear proof of that will not suffice.) The only exception in relation to documentation is for permanent residence: in the AIRE Centre's experience, it appears that, despite what is stated in Article 25 of Directive 2004/38, permanent residence documentation is a necessary condition of proving that one is permanently resident in the UK (or the family member of a permanently resident EU national) for benefits purposes. Because of administrative obstruction in providing such documentation, this is often an insurmountable challenge. The result is that the process looks more like this:



21. The benefits refused include certain special non-contributory benefits covered under Article 70 of Regulation 883/04/EC. Jackie Morin from DG Employment, Social Affairs and Equal Opportunities has responded to a complaint from the AIRE Centre and ILPA that this is also unlawful under that Regulation; Mr Morin agrees with us and we understand the Commission is investigating the issue. Mr Morin has also agreed with us that certain further restrictions on social assistance benefits to central and east European EU migrants in the UK are illegal. (See attached letter of 2 February 2010.)
22. Recently, UKBA have added a new step: certain homeless EU migrants are facing expulsion from the UK on the basis that they are not exercising residence rights. We have attached a paper about this issue, but the problem essentially is this: the authorities claim that certain migrants who are not a burden on the social assistance system (because, as a matter of domestic legislation and practice, they cannot be) but who are receiving healthcare from the National Health Service are threatened with expulsion on the basis that they are not exercising residence rights. This seems difficult to square with Article 7(1)(b) of the Directive.

23. Other EU migrants do not face formal expulsion but informal expulsion from local authorities when they apply for benefits (see paragraph 24(d) below).
24. The UK system is surely unique, as is every Member State's system for the distribution of social assistance. It provides an important example of the kinds of obstacles EU migrants can face once they have been residing in the UK. The AIRE Centre and ILPA have seen, for example, the following:
- a. Pregnant women receiving Jobseeker's Allowance (a special non-contributory benefit and '*a benefit of a financial nature intended to facilitate access to employment in the labour market*', Cases C-2&3/08 Vatsouras & Koupatantze v Arbeitsgemeinschaft Nürnberg 900, para 37), are told by benefits officers eleven weeks before they are due to give birth, to switch to Income Support, another special non-contributory benefit for those who cannot work. They are then refused Income Support by decision makers on the basis that they no longer have a right to reside. The refusals have been held up by the English tribunals even though the EU migrant may have been working in the past, intends to begin seeking work very soon after they give birth and/or, as a result of administrative obstruction, was advised to give up Jobseeker's Allowance by benefits advisers. See, e.g., [2007] UKSSCSC CIS_4010_2006.
 - b. EU migrant women escaping domestic violence have been unable to access benefits because they are forced to demonstrate that they are currently workers or self-employed active or that their abusive spouses are. In one case, a woman the AIRE Centre was advising and whom the Centre was going to represent in her appeal against a refusal of benefits (as she had, in the Centre's view, acquired permanent residence in the UK) was evicted from social housing and told that she would only be housed temporarily if she agreed to accept a coach ticket to return to Warsaw. The Centre was unable to convince her not to go, as her circumstances had become so vulnerable, and now it appears that the appeal will fail as she has left the UK.
 - c. EU migrants with disabilities who come to the UK to seek work are not permitted to access income-based Employment and Support Allowance, a social security benefit introduced in 2008 to '*offer you*

personalised support and financial help, so that you can do appropriate work, if you are able to' (Government website about the benefit¹²). See The Employment and Support Allowance Regulations 2008, Regulation 70(3)(b)(i). This appears to violate the Vatsouras judgment, cited above.

c. Inadequate Response to the Exploitation of EU Migrant Workers

25. Between April and December 2009, 86 of the 527 individuals (16%) referred to the UK's National Referral Mechanism for identifying victims of human trafficking were EU migrants.¹³ From this data, and based on the AIRE Centre's experience operating a specialist second-tier advice service for victims of human trafficking, it appears that those most at risk of trafficking and exploitation are from the central and east European countries that joined the EU in 2004 and 2007. The AIRE Centre and ILPA both work closely with the Anti-Trafficking Legal Project, a London-based group of lawyers working on trafficking issues who have noted considerable confusion about the rights of EU migrant trafficking victims.

26. The way the UK authorities (and perhaps other Member States) have handled accession has exacerbated the potential for trafficking and exploitation already inherent in a free-movement regime where individuals are allowed to cross borders but not allowed to take up work. We have attached a recent training paper on the rights of accession nationals in the UK, which should give the Commission some idea of the problems resulting from the UK's accession regimes.

27. In relation to the Worker Registration Scheme ('WRS') for A8 nationals (whose countries joined in 2004), the UK Government's own Migration Advisory Committee has noted: *'Immigrants' confusion about the WRS could also mean that, in practice, the scheme affects employment relations. Unscrupulous employers could potentially take advantage of immigrants who are unaware of their rights under the scheme. This possibility was reflected in evidence received from the Association of Labour Providers, the Gangmasters Licensing Authority and the governments of Poland, the Czech Republic and Estonia who also raised concerns about the registration process which*

¹² http://www.direct.gov.uk/en/DisabledPeople/FinancialSupport/esa/DG_171894.

¹³ Statistical data from the UK Human Trafficking Centre can be found at <http://www.soca.gov.uk/about-soca/about-the-ukhtc/statistical-data>.

requires A8 immigrants to send their passports by post. The Trades' Union Congress also stated that differential A8 employment restrictions in EU countries lead to bogus self-employment and undocumented working that left such workers vulnerable to exploitation.' ('Review of the UK's transitional measures for nationals of member states that acceded to the European Union in 2004', Migration Advisory Committee, April 2004, para 5.20.)

28. The principal mechanism of control of the WRS is found in Regulation 9 of the Accession (Immigration and Worker Registration) Regulations 2004, which creates an offence for employers (not workers) to employ unregistered A8 workers. It appears that there have been no prosecutions or investigations of this offence, leaving employers free to abuse the registration system and take advantage of accession workers. Workers who did not register (because they do not understand the complex scheme or because their employers did not tell them about it) cannot generally access social assistance and social security benefits, leaving them more vulnerable to unscrupulous employers.
29. Bulgarian and Romanian nationals, who must obtain worker authorisation in the UK, often do not understand this requirement. As a result, many appear to have been exploited by those who take advantage of their 'illegal' status.
30. As a matter of English law, employees who have 'illegal contracts' cannot bring claims against employers for scrupulous employment practices, such as not paying minimum wage (although they can bring race discrimination claims). It is not clear if this affects unregistered A8 workers, who have not committed an offence but whose employers (in theory) have, but the AIRE Centre has worked with many exploited A8 workers who are unwilling to bring claims because their employers have told them that they are 'illegal' and they fear the consequences of asserting their rights. Many Romanians and Bulgarians, who do not understand the authorisation system, have been registered by employers as self-employed and then exploited in the workforce (e.g. not paid wages). It appears in these cases it is likely that the Bulgarian or Romanian workers will be convicted of an offence and will not be able to bring their employers to justice.
31. All EU citizens of course have a right to be self-employed in another Member State. This is also a poorly understood right. The AIRE Centre has worked with many A2 nationals in vulnerable circumstances who are seeking to take

up self-employment in order to provide for themselves and, if necessary, access social assistance and social security benefits. The UK authorities are extremely unlikely to accept that an individual is self-employed without that person providing extensive proof (e.g. invoices) of the kind a British Citizen would never have to prove she is self-employed for other purposes. The tribunals in the UK have made it clear, recently, that such onerous standards are not allowed. See [2009] UKUT 58 (AAC). However, it appears the authorities continue to apply them when self-employed accession nationals seek benefits or residence documentation.

d. Disregard for and Confusion about the Rights of EU Migrant Prisoners and Their Families

32. The AIRE Centre works closely with Hibiscus, a charity in the UK providing assistance to foreign women in prison; the two organisations work together to advise foreign EU migrant women in prison. The authorities systematically disregard basic provisions of EU law in relation to this group. There is already a brisk litigation practice developing in the UK courts around deportations that are unlawful in the light of Chapter VI of Directive 2004/38. There are other issues affecting migrant EU prisoners that have attracted less attention but are just as worrying from the perspective of EU law.
33. Notably, EU migrants are refused transfer to an open prison or refused Home Detention Curfew ('HDC', where individuals live at home but are 'tagged' to track their movements) in situations where British Citizens would be transferred because they are on an 'immigration hold' (i.e. the authorities are considering deporting them at the end of their sentence, but have taken no legal action to do so). This deprives EU citizens the right to work (which is extended to those in these facilities or with HDC). For many of the women prisoners the AIRE Centre has advised, this also means that they are unable to see their children regularly, whereas a similarly situated British Citizen would. This differential treatment is based uniquely on EU migrants' status as foreigners and the hypothetical possibility of their deportation under Chapter VI of the Directive. This problem poses serious questions under Regulation 1612/68/EEC generally, Article 24 of Directive 2004/38, the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union (Article 18, Article 20, Article 45) and the ECHR. In one case the AIRE Centre has advised on, involving a German

citizen, she was moved to an open prison and moved back one week later, when the UKBA found out about the move to the open prison and declared she was on an immigration hold. This was particularly unacceptable as the individual has resided legally in the UK for over five years, has children here, and requires specialist medical treatment unavailable to her in a closed prison but which the open prison was arranging to provide for her. UKBA had taken no action in relation to deporting this woman at the end of her sentence before apparently ordering her return to the closed prison.

34. There is also significant confusion about the relationship between Directive 2004/38 and provisions of European criminal law. Significant numbers of vulnerable EU migrants are presently in prison in the UK waiting to be returned to other EU countries under the European Arrest Warrant (Framework Decision 2002/584/JHA), in some cases for notoriously minor offences. This can deprive their family members in the UK of their residence rights, sometimes, it seems, needlessly. The Court of Justice addressed the relationship between the two instruments to some extent in Case C-123/08 *Wolzenburg*, but more clarification is needed. The same is true for the Framework Decision on the application of the principle of mutual recognition to judgments in criminal matters imposing custodial sentences or measures involving deprivation of liberty (2002/909/JHA). Under that instrument (whose deadline for implementation is 5 December 2011), an EU migrant convicted of an offence in the host Member State can be transferred to a prison in her State of nationality without her consent (Article 6(2)(a)). This will pose a major obstacle to the free-movement rights of her family members who may wish to remain in the host State and be able to visit her regularly in prison.

IV. Recommendations

35. The Commission must raise the cost for Member States of violating EU law on the free movement of persons. The issue of excessive delays in issuing residence documentation, for example, must be seen in its context. Applications for such documentation are free under the Directive. Normally in the UK (as elsewhere in Europe), applications for residence documentation for third-country nationals under domestic immigration law are extremely expensive (in the UK, usually between £500 and £1,000). These 'free' applications may therefore appear to be low priority for UKBA, as they do not

generate income for the Agency. Such an approach is not acceptable: the the prohibition on charging for these applications furthers the teleological aim of Directive 2004/38, which is to facilitate the free movement of persons and is supported by strict time deadlines which need to be enforced. A similar cost-benefit analysis applies to the other problems described above: at present, for the UK authorities, the cost of not respecting the rights of vulnerable and marginalised EU migrants does not outweigh the benefits (financial, political). In order to raise the cost of these EU-law violations, we recommend that the Commission:

- a. consults more frequently with national experts, particularly those working with vulnerable EU migrant populations (lawyers and NGOs), about legal problems;
- b. undertakes more oversight of domestic legislation and practice through frequent communication with Member States and NGOs about implementation issues affecting vulnerable and marginalised groups.

36. The Commission must also clarify ambiguous aspects of EU law so as to ensure that Member States do not take advantages of ambiguities in ways that pose an obstacle to the exercise of free-movement rights. The Commission has provided some specific guidance in 2008 and 2009 on implementation of the Directive, but that guidance was not comprehensive and did not cover some issues of importance to vulnerable and marginalised migrants, including: the rights of EU migrant victims of trafficking and exploitation; the rights of EU migrants who are victims of domestic violence; the correct approach to providing social assistance and social security benefits to EU migrants; the circumstances in which EU migrants can be expelled on the basis that they are not exercising residence rights; and the rights of EU migrant prisoners and their families (particularly the relationship between Directive 2004/38 and other provisions of EU criminal law).

37. The AIRE Centre and ILPA are available to discuss these matters further with the Commission. Do not hesitate to be in touch.

Adam Weiss

Please note that the attachments referred to in the letter above can be forwarded in electronic format if required. Please contact elizabeth.white@ilpa.org.uk

Legislative Update: EU Immigration and Asylum Law
27 May 2010

Steve Peers, University of Essex

[developments since April 2010 update in ***bold/italics/underline***]

1. Asylum

Adopted measures (UK opt in to all; Ireland opt in to all except 4).

1. Decision 2000/596/EC on European refugee fund (OJ 2000 L 252/12)
2. Regulation 2725/2000 on Eurodac (OJ 2000 L 316/1): applied from 15.1.03
3. Directive 2001/55 on temporary protection (OJ 2001 L 212/12)
 Regulation 407/2002 implementing Eurodac Regulation (OJ 2002 L 62/1)
4. Directive 2003/9 on reception conditions (OJ 2003 L 31/18): deadline Feb. 2005
5. Dublin II Regulation 343/2003 (OJ 2003 L 50/1): in force 1.9.03
 Commission Reg. 1560/2003 implementing Dublin II (OJ 2003 L 222/3)
6. Directive 2004/83 on refugee/subsidiary protection definition and content (OJ 2004 L 304/12): deadline 10 October 2006
7. Decision on second European Refugee Fund (OJ 2004 L 2004 L 252/12)
8. Directive 2005/85 on asylum procedures (OJ 2005 L 326/13)—deadline 1.12.2007
9. European Refugee Fund (OJ 2007 L 144/1)
- 10. Reg on European Asylum Support Office, parallel amendment to Refugee Fund (not yet published) – adopted May 2010**

Proposals

- proposal for Directive on long-term resident status for refugees and persons with subsidiary protection: COM (2007) 298, 6 June 2007 – discussion stopped for now
- proposed amendments to Dublin II, Eurodac and reception Directive (COM (2008) 815, 820 and 825, Dec. 2008) – under discussion; UK and Irish opt-in to Dublin II and Eurodac; EP first-reading vote, May 2009; discussed at JHA Council, 4 June 2009
- proposed amendment of Refugee Fund, as regards EU resettlement programme: COM (2009) 456, 2 Sep. 2009; UK opt in; **EP first-reading vote, May 2010**
- proposed legislation to give police forces and Europol access to Eurodac data: COM (2009) 342 and 344, 10 Sep. 2009; UK and Ireland position not yet known
- proposed recast of qualification Directive - COM (2009) 551, Oct. 2009; UK opt out; Ireland position not yet known; EP and Council discussions underway
- proposed recast of procedures Directive - COM (2009) 554, Oct. 2009; UK opt out; Ireland position not yet known; EP and Council discussions underway

2. Legal Migration

Adopted measures

1. Reg. 1030/2002 on residence permit format (OJ 2002 L 157/1) [UK opt in]
- amended by Reg. 330/2008 (OJ 2008 L 115/1)
2. Reg. 859/2003 on 3rd-country nationals' social security (OJ 2003 L 124/1) [UK, Ir opt in]
3. Directive 2003/86 on family reunion (OJ 2003 L 251/12): deadline Oct. 2005
- challenge to validity of parts of the Directive decided in favour of the Council (Case C-540/03 *EP v Council* [2006] ECR I-5769)
4. Long-term residents Directive 2003/109 (OJ 2004 L 16/44): deadline Jan. 2006
5. Directive 2004/114 on migration of third-country students, pupils, trainees & volunteers (OJ 2004 L 375/12): deadline 12.1.2007
6. Directive 2005/71 on admission of researchers (OJ 2005 L 289/15): deadline 12.10.2007
7. Recommendation on admission of researchers (OJ 2005 L 289/26)
8. Decision on asylum and immigration information exchange (OJ 2006 L 283/40) [UK, Ire opt in]
9. Decision establishing European integration Fund (OJ 2007 L 168/18) [UK, Ire opt in]
10. Directive 2009/50 on the conditions of entry and residence of third-country nationals for the purposes of highly qualified employment ('Blue Card' directive) (OJ 2009 L 155/17)

Proposed measures

1. Regulation extending Regulation 883/2004 on social security for EU citizens to third-country nationals who move within the EC (COM (2007) 439, 23 July 2007) – discussions restarted, **possible agreement at June 2010 employment Council**
2. Directive on a single application procedure for a single permit for third-country nationals to reside and work in the territory of a Member State and on a common set of rights for third-country workers legally residing in a Member State (COM (2007) 638, 23 Oct. 2007) – discussions restarted

forthcoming:

proposals on admission of intra-corporate transferees and seasonal workers; Green paper on family reunion – due 2010

3. Borders and Visas

Adopted measures [UK & Ire have opted out of all measures except UK opt in to 1, 5]

1. Reg. 1683/95 on common visa format (OJ 1995 L 164/1)
 - amended by Reg. 334/2002 (OJ 2002 L 53/7)
 - amended by Reg. 856/2008, OJ 2008 L 235/1
2. Reg. 539/2001 establishing visa list (OJ 2001 L 81/1)
 - amended by Reg. 2414/2001 moving Romania to 'white list' (OJ 2001 L 327/1)
 - amended by Reg. 453/2003 moving Ecuador to 'black list' (OJ 2003 L 69/10)
 - amended by Reg. 851/2005 on reciprocity for visas (OJ 2005 L 141/3)
 - amended by Reg. 1932/2006 (OJ 2006 L 405/23)
 - amended by Reg 1244/2009 lifting visa requirement for some Western Balkan countries (OJ 2009 L 336/1)
3. Reg. 789/2001 on procedure for amending CCI (OJ 2001 L 116/2)
4. Reg. 1091/2001 on freedom to travel for holders of long-term visas (OJ 2001 L 150/4)
5. Reg. 333/2002 on visa stickers for persons coming from unrecognised entities (OJ 2002 L 53/4)
6. Reg. 415/2003 on visas at the border and visas for seamen (OJ 2003 L 64/1)
7. Reg. 693/2003 on FTD and FRTD (OJ 2003 L 99/8)
8. Reg. 694/2003 on format for FTD and FRTD (OJ 2003 L 99/15)
9. Reg 1295/2003 re special rules for Olympic Games (OJ 2003 L 183/1)
10. Decision establishing Visa Information System (VIS) (OJ 2004 L 213/5)
11. Reg. 2007/2004 establishing External Borders Agency (OJ 2004 L 349/1)
12. Reg. 2133/2004 on biometric features in EU passports (OJ 2004 L 369/5)
13. Recommendation on visa issuing for researchers (OJ 2005 L 289/23)
14. Reg. 2046/2005 on Olympic visas: OJ 2005 L 334/1
15. Reg. 562/2006, borders code: OJ 2006 L 105/1 (applies from 13.10.2006)
 - amended by Reg. 296/2008, OJ 2008 L 97/60
 - amended by Reg. 81/2009, regarding use of the VIS (OJ 2009 L 35/56)
16. Two decisions on transit through new Member States, Switzerland (OJ 2006 L 167)
 - see implementation information, OJ 2006 C 251/20
17. Reg 1931/2006 on local border traffic within enlarged EU/at external borders of EU (OJ 2006 L 405/1)
18. Decision establishing European Borders Fund (OJ 2007 L 144)
19. Regulation 863/2007 on border guard teams (OJ 2007 L 199/30)
20. Decisions on transit through Romania, Bulgaria, Switzerland (OJ 2008 L 161)
21. Reg. 767/2008 establishing Visa Information System (OJ 2008 L 218/60) ; third-pillar VIS Decision (OJ 2008 L 218/129)
22. Reg. 390/2009 on biometric visas (OJ 2009 L 131/1)
23. Reg. 444/2009 on biometric passports (OJ 2009 L 142/1)
24. Reg. 810/2009 on visa code (OJ 2009 L 243/1) – applied 5 April 2010
25. Reg. 265/2010 on long-stay visas code (OJ 2010 L 85/1) – applied 5 April 2010

Implementing Measures

Common Consular Instructions, consolidated text: [2005] OJ C 326/1
- amended by Decision of June 2006 (OJ 2006 L 175)

Proposed measures [UK, Ire opt out of all except 5, 7]

1. Regulation codifying Regulations establishing EC visa list (COM (2008) 761, 28 Nov. 2008) – discussion terminated in Council working group
2. Regulation codifying Regulations establishing EC visa format (COM (2008) 891, 19 Dec. 2008)
3. Regulation on Schengen evaluation (COM (2009) 102, March 2009) - discussions terminated in Council
4. Regulation establishing agency to manage VIS, SIS and Eurodac (COM (2009) 293, 24 June 2009) - discussions underway in Council
5. Amendment of Frontex Regulation (COM (2010) 61, 24 Feb. 2010) - discussions underway in Council, EP

6. Amendment of visa list re Albania, Bosnia (COM (2010) 256, 27 May 2010)

forthcoming:

- proposals on travel documents, visa list (2010); entry-exit programme and registered traveller programme (2011)

4. Irregular Migration

Adopted measures [UK opt-in to all except 7, 12, 13, 17, 20, 21]

1. Dir. 2001/40 on mutual recognition of expulsion decisions (*OJ 2001 L 149/34*); implement 2.12.02
2. Directive 2001/51 on carrier sanctions (*OJ 2001 L 187/45*); implement 11.2.03
3. Regulation 2424/2001 on funding SIS II (*OJ 2001 L 328/4*)
4. Decision 2001/886/JHA on funding SIS II (*OJ 2001 L 328/1*)
5. Framework Decision on trafficking in persons (*OJ 2002 L 203/1*)
6. Directive & Framework Decision on facilitation of illegal entry and residence (*OJ 2002 L 328*)
7. Directive 2003/110 on assistance with transit for expulsion by air (*OJ 2003 L 321/26*)
8. Conclusions on transit via land for expulsion—adopted 22 Dec. 2003 by Council
9. Reg. 378/2004 on procedure for amendments to Sirene manual: (*OJ 2004 L 64*)
10. Reg. 377/2004 on ILO network (*OJ 2004 L 64/1*)
11. Decision on costs of expulsion (*OJ 2004 L 60/55*)
12. Dir. 2004/81 on res. permits for trafficking victims (*OJ 2004 L 261/19*)
13. Reg. 871/2004 on new functionalities for SIS (*OJ 2004 L 162/29*)
14. Directive 2004/82 on transmission of passenger data (*OJ 2004 L 261/64*)

15. Decision on joint flights for expulsion (OJ 2004 L 261/28)
16. Decision on early warning system (OJ 2005 L 83/48)
17. Regulation 1987/2006 establishing SIS II (OJ 2006 L 381/4)
18. Regulation 1988/2006 on SIS II, amending Reg. 2424/2001 (OJ 2006 L 411/1)
19. Decision on European return programme (OJ 2007 L 144)
20. Directive 2008/115 (Returns Directive) (OJ 2008 L 348/98) – deadline 24 Dec. 2010
21. Directive 2009/52 on sanctions for employers of irregular migrants (OJ 2009 L 168/24)

Proposed:

1. Regulation amending Regulation on immigration liaison officers (COM (2009) 322, 8 July 2009) – UK opt in

5. External treaties

Readmission

- Hong Kong [UK opt in] (OJ 2004 L 17/23): in force 1.3.04 (OJ 2004 L 64/38)
- Macao - [UK opt in] (OJ 2004 L 143/97); in force 1.6.2004
- Sri Lanka [UK opt in] (OJ 2005 L 124/43); in force 1.5.2005
- Albania – [UK opt in] (OJ 2005 L 124); in force 1.5.2006
- Russia – [UK opt in] OJ 2007 L 129 – in force 1.6. 2007
- Ukraine, Serbia, Montenegro, Bosnia, Macedonia and Moldova – [UK opt in] OJ 2007 L 332 and 334 – in force 1 Jan. 2008
- Pakistan – proposal for signature, March 2009 (COM (2009) 106); UK opted in; Council agreed to sign, June 2009
- **proposal to sign and conclude agreement with Georgia: COM (2010) 199 and 200, 5 May 2010**
- negotiations approved with Morocco, Algeria, Turkey and China
- agreement proposed with Cape Verde, Nov. 2008; negotiation mandate approved by Council June 2009

Other external treaties

- EC/Norway/Iceland re: Dublin Convention: in force 1 March 2001; Protocol in force 1.5.06
- EC/Swiss free movement of persons: concluded 28.2.02 (OJ 2002 L 114); into force 1.6.02
- EC & Switzerland re Schengen, Dublin: applied from Dec. 2008
- ‘Approved Destination Status’ treaty with China: (OJ 2004 L 83/12); in force 1.5.2004
- Dublin II treaty with Denmark: in force, 1 April 2006 (OJ 2006 L 66/38)
- visa facilitation agreement with Russia: in force 1.6.2007 (OJ 2007 L 129)
- visa facilitation agreements with Ukraine, Serbia, Montenegro, Bosnia, Macedonia, Albania and Moldova: OJ 2007 L 332 and 334 – in force 1 Jan. 2008
- visa facilitation agreement with Georgia: **proposal to sign and conclude: COM (2010) 197 and 198, 5 May 2010**
- visa facilitation agreement negotiations proposed with Cape Verde, Nov. 2008, negotiation mandate approved by Council June 2009

- visa abolition treaties agreed with six micro-states (Mauritius, Antigua/Barbuda, Barbados, Seychelles, St. Kitts and Nevis and Bahamas): proposals to sign and conclude treaties - COM (2009) 48, 49, 50, 52, 53 and 55, 12 Feb. 2009 – treaties signed and provisionally in force, May 2009, concluded Nov. 2009
- negotiations for visa abolition treaty with Brazil underway

6. Institutional measures

Decision changing decision-making rules on immigration and asylum (OJ 2004 L 396/47)

Amendments to Court of Justice Statute and rules of procedure - fast-track system for urgent JHA cases (OJ 2008 L 24): in effect 1 March 2008.