Leap

Legal Experts Advisory Panel

Welcome to the third LEAP quarterly bulletin of 2016, which will update you on Fair Trials' and LEAP's work over the past three months and other issues of interest.

You can jump to the different sections using the navigation below.

- Fair Trials and LEAP News
  - LEAP Advisory Board meeting
  - Fair Trials in the Americas
  - New EAW project launched: Beyond Surrender
  - Judicial Remedies Working Group
  - Accessible Letters of Rights project
  - Guest post: Outrage in Bulgaria over secretive transfer of Turkish citizen to Ankara
- Legal Training
  - New online training modules
- Updates on global campaigns
  - Pre-trial Detention
  - Cross-border Justice - INTERPOL
  - Plea bargaining
- Justice In Europe - Policy Updates
  - Legal Aid Directive
  - Consultation on Public Defenders in Ireland
- Justice in Europe - Case Law Updates
  - Court of Justice of the European Union (CJEU)
  - European Court of Human Rights (ECtHR)
  - Domestic Case-Law
  - LEAP Enquiries
- Publications and seminars
  - INTERPOL Lantos event
  - Confederation of European Probation conference
  - PALU Conference in Nairobi
  - Plea-bargaining conference in the US

FAIR TRIALS AND LEAP NEWS

LEAP Advisory Board meeting

Our LEAP Advisory Board is meeting in Brussels on 21st and 22nd October. The Board will discuss the work plan of the LEAP network for the next year. More details on the programme and venue will follow in due course. If you have yet to confirm your participation please contact Gianluca Cesaro (gianluca.cesaro@fairtrials.net)

Back to the top

Fair Trials in the Americas

In September, Fair Trials established its first presence in the Americas. Rebecca Shaeffer, our Legal and Policy Officer in London, moved to Washington, D.C. and was promoted to the position of Senior Legal and Policy Officer. Rebecca will continue to lead our work on plea bargaining from there and will work towards establishing a dedicated regional hub covering the Americas.

Back to the top

New EAW project launched: Beyond Surrender

On 14th July, Fair Trials launched a new two-year European Commission-funded project, *Beyond Surrender*. Through this project we will look at good and best practices in post-surrender treatment to support effective implementation of the European Arrest Warrant (EAW), the European Roadmap Directives and European Supervision Orders. We will be monitoring EAW cases in receiving countries to determine whether the suspect or accused persons' defence rights were respected through the criminal proceedings in the receiving country, and whether there were other human rights-related impacts on the person or his/her family. We will then take the most compelling cases and create short video pieces around the cases that can be used for our advocacy on the urgent need for EAW reform. If you have any cases that you think would be worthwhile to monitor, please email Silvia Lorenzo Perez (silvia.lorenzoperez@fairtrials.net). We are specifically looking at cases of surrender to any of the four project countries (Spain, Poland, Romania and Lithuania).

Back to the top

Judicial Remedies Working Group

The LEAP Working Group on judicial remedies had been established to conduct a comparative study across all EU Member States to obtain information about the implementation and standard practice of the 'exclusionary rule' at national level. The Working Group gathers representatives from 21 countries and is chaired by FTE and Vania Costa Ramos and is supported by Dimitrios Giannoulopoulos as Academic Advisor. In order to develop the comparative study, Fair Trials circulated a questionnaire amongst all members of the Working Group with a view to gather input from representatives of each Member State.

We thank all the members of the Working Group for the time spent answering the questionnaire. If you are a member of the Working Group and you are yet to submit your responses, please respond to Tzeni Varfi (tzeni.varfi@fairtrials.net). Our hope is to have collected all of the relevant responses by the end of October, with a view to organizing a meeting of the Working Group in late November or early December.

Back to the top

Accessible Letters of Rights project

Now in its second year of implementation, the Accessible Letter of Rights project aims at researching notification rights standards across the EU and suggesting ways to improve its accessibility to laypeople, as well as at highlighting gaps in the implementation of the Right to Information Directive. The project is led by our LEAP Advisory Board member Hungarian Helsinki Committee (HHC) and jointly implemented with Fair Trials, Rights International Spain (RIS), Human Rights Monitoring Institute (HRMI) and the Bulgarian Helsinki Committee.

Since the launch of the project, Fair Trials has conducted research on standards and practices around the notification of rights in 30 non-EU countries. The research also includes an assessment of the implementation of the Letter of Rights requirements in the EU Right to Information Directive; this was based on our earlier survey of the LEAP membership, to which 42 LEAP members replied. Thanks to you all for your contributions. The report can be accessed here. If you have any amendments or corrections to the research document as it was initially shared with our project partners, we would be very interested in receiving them. Each project partner will now focus their research work on their own jurisdiction with FTE looking at the development and use of the Letter of Rights in France, a jurisdiction which appears to have led the way in producing an accessible letter of rights.

The resulting country reports as well as the findings of the initial research will be incorporated into the final comparative report which will be published towards the end of the project in mid-2017. This will highlight common themes and significant differences between countries, presenting examples of good practice and reform proposals.

Back to the top

Guest post: Outrage in Bulgaria over secretive transfer of Turkish citizen to Ankara

Earlier in August, our LEAP advisory board member Asya Mandzhukova contacted us regarding the case of Turkish national Abdullah Büyük, who was unlawfully and secretively transferred to Turkey from Bulgaria in August. Mr. Büyük had previously fled to Bulgaria where he applied for political asylum, fearing persecution from Ankara against everyone suspected to be involved in the July 15th coup. In the meantime, the Turkish authorities issued an INTERPOL arrest warrant against him on charges of terrorism and money laundering. The extradition request was refused by two Bulgarian courts finding that no evidence had been produced and that the charges were likely to be politically motivated. Nonetheless, Mr. Büyük was denied asylum on administrative grounds and taken to the Turkish border in a secretive operation. We wish to thank Asya for sharing this case, which was particularly relevant to our work on cross-border justice and the politically-motivated abuse of INTERPOL. We invite all LEAP members to keep on sending through any relevant case regarding specifically pre-trial detention, cross-border justice and the implementation of the Roadmap directives, as well as abuses of fair trial rights more generally.

If you have any news developments in your jurisdiction that you think would be interesting to share with us and the LEAP network, please let us know by contacting Gianluca Cesaro (gianluca.cesaro@fairtrials.net).

Back to the top

LEGAL TRAINING

New online training modules

As part of our mission to build a network of fair trial defenders in Europe with a solid expertise in fair trial issues, we keep on feeding our online legal training programme with new modules. Therefore, we are delighted to announce that three new units are now available on Fair Trials' website, concerning:

- Cross-Border Cases
- Pre-trial Detention
- The EU's Access to a Lawyer Directive

The trainings have been funded by the Legal Education Foundation and are free to access for everyonehere. Each module is divided in short lessons that can be easily followed at your own pace. We believe that the trainings can be very helpful to your work, so we encourage you to sign up and disseminate the link to your colleagues and Bar Associations.

Back to the top

UPDATES ON GLOBAL CAMPAIGNS

This section displays current developments in Fair Trials' global campaigns: cross-border justice (including INTERPOL), pre-trial detention and plea bargaining. European regional campaigning is further illustrated in the "Justice in Europe" sections below.

Back to the top

Pre-trial Detention

During the last quarter, we held two meetings with LEAP members to promote our recent pre-trial detention report: *A Measure of Last Resort? The practice of pre-trial detention decision making in the EU*. In July, we held a meeting with LEAP members, judges, prosecutors and probation officers from 10 EU Member States, to discuss the findings of our report and potential areas of future action. There was

broad consensus on the findings of our report and its recommendations, as well as some useful ideas on how to address pre-trial detention issues through changing the incentives causing prosecutors to request pre-trial detention and judges to order it in too many cases.

In addition, in September, Fair Trials put on a side event at the OSCE Human Dimension Implementation Meeting (HDIM), which is the largest human rights conference in Europe, held annually in Warsaw. The side event focussed on the pre-trial detention report and its relevance not only within the EU but across Europe more widely and was attended by a number of LEAP members from Poland. The panellists for the event included Adam Bodnar, Polish Commissioner for Human Rights, Sergei Golubok, Attorney at Double Bridge Law in Russia, and Nadejda Atayeva, President of the Association for Human Rights in Central Asia. The event made clear that pre-trial detention is a major issue across Europe and an area in which reform is of critical importance.

Earlier this month, our regional report on the practice of pre-trial detention in the EU was also presented by Libby McVeigh at a seminar held at the Institute of Advanced Legal Studies in London and organised in association with the European Criminal Law Association (ECLA, UK) and the Centre for European Constitutional Law. LEAP members Ed Cape and Dr Maria Mousmouti joined us on the panel.

Back to the top

Cross-border Justice - INTERPOL

We have continued to work on a number of cases in the last quarter with the aim of pointing out the main issues highlighted in our INTERPOL campaign, including cases involving the possible misuse of the Red Notice system by Turkey, Tajikistan, and Egypt. We also helped a LEAP member with an access request to the Commission for the Control of INTERPOL's Files ('CCF') involving the application of INTERPOL's 'refugee policy'.
In the coming months, INTERPOL's reform process on its internal data processing mechanisms is expected to come to a close, and we are hoping that at the meeting of INTERPOL's General Assembly in November, INTERPOL's member states will be voting on reforms that could have a significant impact on the way that the CCF functions. We will also be hosting a meeting jointly with REDRESS during the next session of the UN Committee against Torture in December, to continue discussions between the Committee and INTERPOL on the best ways of collaboration.

Back to the top

Plea bargaining

The work on our plea bargaining campaign continues. Together with our pro bono partners Freshfields Buckhaus Deringer, Fair Trials has collected information on the existence and operation of guilty plea arrangements in 90 global jurisdictions. We have conducted further survey research in a number of key

jurisdictions (including Georgia, Serbia, Singapore, South Africa, New Zealand and Germany among others) to ascertain the views of practitioners on the human rights impacts of these practices. Some LEAP members have also been contacted to fill out a survey on guilty plea arrangements in their jurisdictions. A big thank you is due to those of you who have filled these out.

The global survey is designed to identify the spread of plea bargaining across the world, the challenges it presents for human rights and due process protection in the absence of the traditional guarantees pursuant to a full trial, and the kinds of safeguards being employed globally to protect against these. Rebecca will be presenting initial findings at a conference of US-based researchers focusing on plea bargaining in mid-October in Arlington, Virginia, as the first step in consultation on the findings prior to the release of a planned report on the research in early 2017.

The report on plea bargaining follows a roundtable on the subject last November in Washington, and a submission in relation to proposed changes to the system for incentivising early guilty pleas in England and Wales. We are also in the process of identifying jurisdictions which may benefit from advocacy, research or other support in developing a guilty plea practice that respects the human rights of defendants subject to it while ensuring that it meets the intended aims for which it was introduced.
If you have insights into the way guilty plea agreements operate in your jurisdiction, please get in touch with Rebecca (Rebecca.shaeffer@fairtrials.net).

Back to the top

JUSTICE IN EUROPE - Policy Updates

Legal Aid Directive

We are delighted to announce that on 4th October, the European Parliament finally approved the Legal Aid Directive. This directive is the most recent legislative measure (Measure C2) of the Roadmap of procedural rights.
Earlier in June, the European Parliament and the Council had reached an agreement on the proposed directive, accommodating a number of substantial amendments in compliance with the right to a fair trial proposed by LEAP in the Position Paper published in February 2015. These include: a wider scope of the directive to include legal aid throughout criminal proceedings rather than being limited to provisional legal aid; the requirement on the independence of legal aid lawyers; and the introduction of a broad remedies provision. We issued a news piece on the final text agreed than can be found here.
Once adopted by the Council of the EU, Member States will have 30 months to transpose it into their national legislation.

Back to the top

Consultation on Public Defenders in Ireland

Fair Trials was recently approached by the Ministry of Justice in Ireland which is currently considering whether to establish a Public Defender service in Ireland as an alternative to the present system of criminal legal aid, now provided by private practitioners and funded by the State. As part of this process, Fair Trials was invited to offer its view and provide an examination of various models of Public Defender system that will be examined and evaluated in their report to the Parliament. Following this inquiry, Fair Trials is conducting in-depth research and will soon reach LEAP network from countries that we identified as having a similar legal aid services as opposed to court appointed (ex officio) systems. Therefore, we are trying to collect different views and provide an examination of similar public defender systems in other countries.

Back to the top

JUSTICE IN EUROPE - Case Law Updates

Court of Justice of the European Union (CJEU)

JZ v Prokuratura Rejonowa Łódź–Śródmieście, Case C-294/16 PPU, 28 July 2016.

A Polish court raised the question to the CJEU as to whether time spent on curfew combined with electronic monitoring in one Member State could amount to a period of detention to be deducted from the overall detention period to be served in another Member State pursuant surrender under EAW proceedings.

The complainant, Mr JZ, had been convicted in Poland in 2007 and was given a three-year custodial sentence. After fleeing to the UK, an EAW was issued against him by the Polish authorities. Mr JZ was arrested in the UK in 2014 and while awaiting surrender was subject to a nine-hour night-time curfew, electric monitoring and the obligation to report to a police station at fixed times on a daily basis or several times a week. The referring court asked whether the measures imposed on the accused could be classified as 'detention' within the meaning of Article 26(1) of Framework Decision 2002/584. Under this legal provision, "the issuing Member State is to deduct all periods of detention arising from the execution of a European arrest warrant from the total period of detention to be served in that Member State as a result of a custodial sentence or detention order being passed."

The Court held that whilst the measures taken against Mr JZ in the UK certainly restricted his freedom of movement, they "are not, in principle […] so restrictive as to give rise to a deprivation of liberty comparable to that arising from imprisonment and thus to be classified as 'detention' within the meaning of that provision, which it is nevertheless for the referring court to ascertain."

Our LEAP member Rebecca Niblock wrote a post in her law firm's blog where she summarised the facts and the Courts assessment and shared her conclusions on the decision (the blog can be found here).

Aleksei Petruhhin, Case C-182/15, 6 September 2016.

Aleksei Petruhhin is an Estonian national who was subject to a priority Red Notice on Interpol's website. He was arrested in Latvia and put in custody on 3rd October 2014. Shortly after, the Latvian authorities received an extradition request for him from Russia. In light of a provision of the Latvian Code of Criminal Procedure whereby extradition of Latvian citizens to a foreign country would not be granted, the claimant appealed the decision of the Prosecutor to authorise extradition, asserting that he should be granted the same protection as an EU citizen. In addition, the claimant invoked an international agreement between Estonia and Latvia whereby "the personal and economic rights of the nationals of

one of the Contracting Parties present in the territory of the other Contracting Party shall enjoy in that territory the same legal protection as [the rights of] the nationals of the other Contracting Party." The Latvian Supreme Court referred to the CJEU the question of whether the nationals of another Member State must benefit from the rule which prohibits the extradition by the first Member State of its own nationals in deference to the principle of non-discrimination on grounds of nationality and the freedom of movement and of residence of Union citizens. The Latvian Supreme Court also asked whether the requested Member State must verify that the extradition will not prejudice the rights protected by the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union.

The Court found that a Member State is not required to grant every Union citizen who has moved within its territory the same protection against extradition as that granted to its own nationals. Additionally, the Court held that it is the responsibility of the executing State to ponder the existence of a "real risk of inhuman or degrading treatment of individuals in the requesting third State."

Back to the top

European Court of Human Rights (ECtHR)

Ibrahim and others v United Kingdom [GC], App nos. 50541/08, 50571/08, 50573/08, and 40351/09, 13 September 2016.

In September, the ECtHR Grand Chamber released the final judgement on the case of Ibrahim and Others v United Kingdom, in which Fair Trials had intervened in 2015. The case concerns investigations carried out in the immediate aftermath of the attempted suicide bomb attacks in London in 2005. Points of controversy arose from the fact that the police officer who conducted the questioning suspended the right of the suspects to access a lawyer on grounds of public security. Subsequently, incriminatory statements made by the suspects during that first interrogation were relied upon in the proceedings which led to their conviction. In a December 2013 judgment, the Chamber found that the restrictions on the right to access a lawyer in this case did not infringe Article 6 of the Convention. The case was then referred to the Grand Chamber.

In its final judgment, the Grand Chamber held that there had been no violation of the rights of the three applicants (Mr Ibrahim, Mr Mohammed and Mr Omar) under Article 6 (1) and (3). Conversely, the Court did found a violation of Article 6(1) (3) of the Convention with regards to the fourth applicant, Mr Abdurahman. Mr Abdurahman was initially called to testify as a witness. However, during questioning it emerged he had been involved in assisting the other three applicants following the failed attack. At that point, the fourth applicant argues that he should have being arrested, notified of his right to remain silent and to receive legal assistance, which the police failed to do. The Court concluded that there had not been compelling reasons for restricting his access to legal advice and for failing to inform him of his right to remain silent. Given the absence of compelling reasons and the inability of the Government to demonstrate the overall fairness of the proceedings, the Court concluded that Mr Abdurahman's trial had been prejudiced by the decision not to caution him and to restrict his access to legal advice. However, the Grand Chamber dismissed the applicant's claim for pecuniary and non-pecuniary damages; it moreover considered the claimed costs of legal expenses to be "excessive" and subsequently reduced the reimbursement to 16,000€.

Back to the top

Domestic case-law

We have been able to gather a number of judicial decisions adopted at the national level, which have now been included in our case-law database. We thank you all for your very valuable contributions and we encourage you to keep sharing domestic judicial decisions that are relevant to our work on international cooperation, implementation of the Roadmap Directives, judicial remedies and pre-trial detention. You will find below a summary of the cases we have received over the past three months. If you need further information or would like to share relevant judicial decisions, please contact Silvia (silvia.lorenzoperez@fairtrials.net).

United Kingdom:

Italy v VS (anonymised), Westminster Magistrates' Court, 10 June 2016 (Ben Cooper).

This case concerns the extradition of an Italian citizen from the UK to Italy pursuant to an EAW, in order to serve a prison conviction for an offence he had committed in 1981 and for which he was tried in absentia. The judge analysed potential breaches of Article 6 due to claims of the complainant regarding serious irregularities in the judicial proceedings and failure to provide an effective remedy, such as a retrial. For this reason, the judge refused extradition based on the impossibility of the surrendered person to receive a retrial were he surrendered to Italy.

Additionally, the complainant argued that the surrender would be in breach of Article 8, given that he has three children, two of them being severely affected by autistic disorders and enjoying a highly dependent relation with their father. When assessing whether the surrender would be compatible with Article 8, the judge discussed a report submitted by the family psychologist containing compelling evidence of the disabilities of the two children who, due to their development delay, required permanent supervision from both parents and tutors. Despite the claims that the life of the children and the wife would be severely impaired if the father was to be extradited, the judge still found that the extradition would not be in breach of Article 8.

EAWs cases concerning surrender to Romania:

In the last quarter LEAP members have shared a number of cases in which national courts have refused to execute EAWs to Romania on the basis of poor prison conditions and the inability of the Romania authorities to honour diplomatic assurances given to executing states.

Timis County Court (Romania) and Daniel Nicolae Rusu, Westminster Magistrates' Court, 11 August 2016 (Anna Oehmichen).

An EAW was issued against the requested person seeking to enforce a four-year imprisonment sentence. The extradition was challenged by the requested person on grounds that poor prison conditions in Romania would amount to a violation of the rights under Article 3 of the ECHR. In its reasoning, the Court heard evidence from 11 people who had previously been extradited to Romania from the UK, which, in the view of the Court, clearly indicated that Romania had systematically breached

all diplomatic assurances given to the UK Government following an extradition request. The Court hence found that the Romanian Government was incapable of honouring its assurances and, as a result, refused to execute the EAW and discharged the suspects.

The Court in Mures (Romania) and the Bistrita-Nasaud Tribunal v Alexandru Zagrean, 8 August 2016; Judicial Authority of Romania v Stelica Ciutac, 11 August 2016; Timis Tribunal (Romania) and Vasile-Laurenjiu Pascaru, 18 August 2016; Judecatoria Sectorolui 2 Bucresti (Romania) and Constantin Airinei, 18 August 2016; Judicial Authority of Romania v Cristina Sanda Indi, 1 September 2016. Westminster Magistrates' Court (Amelia Nice).

In this series of decisions, the Westminster Magistrate's Court refused to execute EAWs issued by Romania as a result of the evidence assessed in the case of Daniel Nicolae Rusu (cited above). In all these decisions the Magistrate's Court found that Romanian authorities were unable to honour the assurances given to the British Courts that prisoners extradited from the UK would not be subjected to poor prison conditions resulting in a violation of their rights under Article 3 of the ECHR.

Case 23277, Corte di Cassazione, VI Criminal Chamber, 3 June 2016 (Nicola Canestrini).

The Italian Criminal Court of Cassation refused to execute an EAW and surrender the claimant to Romania, thus invalidating the previous contrary decision of a local Court of Appeal. The refusal to extradite was decided on the grounds that: a) the Italian court had not ascertained whether there was a risk of inhuman or degrading treatment in the Romanian prison system, citing reports from the CPT; and b) the Italian court had not asked the Romanian authorities to provide information regarding the prison conditions that the claimant would have been subjected to if surrendered.

Case no. B 2767-16, Solna district court, 18 May 2016 (Jens Sjölund).

In this case, a Swedish District Court found that the requested person was at real risk of being subjected to inhuman or degrading treatment in breach of his rights under Article 3 ECHR, if he was to be surrendered to Romania. The District Court furthermore considered that in spite of assurances and supplementary information provided by the Romanian authorities, the risk had not been eliminated. Therefore, the court refused the surrender to Romania, a decision that was upheld by the Svea Court of Appeal on Friday 16th of September.

Germany:

Case 2 BvR 890/16 of Federal Constitutional Court, 6 September 2016 (Marc Malpricht).

The German Federal Constitutional Court found that surrenders pursuant to an EAW are permissible even when the right not to incriminate oneself is not guaranteed to the same extent in the requesting state's procedural law, as it is under German criminal procedural law and the German Basic Law. The Court admitted that the possibility under British criminal procedural law to use the accused's silence to his or her detriment under certain circumstances is in contradiction with German criminal law and Basic Law. However, the Court found that British law does not violate the German constitutional principles insofar the core content of the right not to incriminate oneself, which has to do with human dignity, is affected. The Court thereby did not admit the argument put forward by the complainant and subsequently accepted his extradition to the United Kingdom for the purpose of criminal prosecution.

This decision of the German Federal Constitutional Court signifies a concerning approach to the implementation of the Presumption of Innocence Directive (EU/2016/343). In Article 7(5), the Presumption of Innocence Directive states that the exercise of the right not to incriminate oneself "shall not be used against them and shall not be considered to be evidence". It is our view that, as with the provisions of all of the Roadmap Directives, this provision should be interpreted as a minimum standard according to which national courts should assess the ability of a requesting state to uphold the fundamental rights of a requested person following surrender. Therefore, this decision raises numerous concerns with regards to implementation of the Roadmap Directives at a domestic level in the context of the EAW.

The Netherlands:

Case 15/02432 of the Supreme Court (Gwen Jansen)

This case addressed some uncertainties in relation to the right to access a lawyer during police questioning, which aroused after a previous verdict of the Supreme Court of 22nd December 2015. In fact, the Supreme Court had previously recognised that arrested suspects have the right to legal assistance during every police questioning. In the present case, however, the Court clarified that the right to access a lawyer is only recognisable under Dutch law as of 22nd of December and does not apply with retroactive effect. Therefore, the Court found that the judicial recognition of the right to legal counsel is only effective from the 22nd December, and that a breach of this right will not lead to exclusion of evidence in trial until the 1st March 2017.

Back to the top

LEAP Enquiries

Thank you all very much for the prompt responses the question Jemima disseminated at the beginning of June regarding extraditions to Greece. In the case concerned, the client of a friend of Fair Trials, Daniel Jones, wanted to challenge the surrender pursuant to an EAW on the grounds of prison conditions and risk of police violence. We disseminated his questions to the LEAP network to find out if there were any cases in which the courts of your jurisdictions had declined extradition to Greece, and we received close to 20 responses. Unfortunately, in most Member States these challenges have not yet been addressed effectively.

LEAP Member Anna Oehmichen from Germany though informed Daniel of two German cases (*Case 1 Ausl 321/15 of the GSIA Dusseldorf* and *Case 1 Ausl 321/15 of the Criminal Division of OLG Stuttgart 1*) that supported Daniel's argument in the High Court. In one very recent case, a court had required very clear assurances from Greek authorities with regards to the conditions the suspect would be held in upon surrender, including the guarantee that German consular staff would be allowed to visit the detainee regularly. The court found that abstract general assurances would not suffice and would lead to the rejection of the extradition request. In the second case, from December 2015, the Higher Regional Court in Stuttgart had denied extradition of a person who had been convicted in Greece, due to poor

prison conditions.

We also want to thank you for your responses to a query from Anna Oehmichen that Silvia disseminated in July. In this occasion, our colleague Anna was interested in cases where national courts had refused to extradite to Romania, pursuant to an EAW, because of politically-motivated grounds, violation of fair trial principles under Article 6 ECHR, violation of Article 3 ECHR or violation of Article 5 ECHR. We also received a substantive number of responses from several countries, which will help Anna and her colleagues to develop a solid case. Anna wishes to extend her gratitude to all of you who took the time to answer and share your cases.

Back to the top

Publications and Seminars

INTERPOL Lantos event (12th Sept)

During her first week in Washington, Rebecca gave evidence in a Congressional briefing on INTERPOL Red Notices, organised by the Lantos Human Rights Commission, a bi-partisan caucus of the U.S. House of Representatives.

Confederation of European Probation conference **(**15th - 16th Sept)

Ralph attended an experts' meeting organised by the Confederation of European Probation in Brussels. The CEP meeting focused on the implementation of the EU Framework Decisions about the mutual recognition of probation decisions. Ralph presented the findings of our PTD regional report, highlighting that pre-trial detention in some jurisdictions is often automatically granted and that many judges are not in favour of using alternative measures. He further emphasised the need to make use of alternatives to detention and to increase mutual trust amongst jurisdictions in Europe.

PALU Conference in Nairobi (12-15 Oct)

Later in October, Libby McVeigh will be travelling to the Pan African Lawyer's Union meeting in Nairobi, together with LEAP members Agata Stajer and Jaanus Tehver and other colleagues from South Africa and Nairobi, in order to discuss plea bargaining in African jurisdictions.

Plea bargaining conference in the US (13-14 October)

Rebecca will be attending the Understanding Guilty Pleas conference on 13th-14th October in Arlington, VA, where she will be presenting findings from our research. The conference will be a great opportunity to discuss cutting-edge research on guilty pleas by engaging with active scholars from various fields, including economics, psychology, criminology and law.

Back to the top

Do you know somebody who could be interested in receiving this bulletin? Then tell them to send an email to gianluca.cesaro@fairtrials.net, we will be happy to sign them up to our mailing list.

If you do not wish to receive the bulletin any longer, please unsubscribe by sending an email to the same address gianluca.cesaro@fairtrials.net

Back to the top

Facebook

Twitter

Website

This publication has been produced with the financial support of the Criminal Justice Programme of the European Commission. The contents of this publication are the sole responsibility of Fair Trials and can in no way be taken to reflect the views of the European Commission.

Copyright © 2016 Fair Trials, All rights reserved.
You are receiving this email because you are on our Legal Experts Advisory Panel mailing list.

Our mailing address is:
Fair Trials Europe
Rue des Deux Eglises 39
1000 Bruxelles
Belgium