
CONTENTS

| | |
|---|-----------|
| <i>Acknowledgements</i> | <i>v</i> |
| <i>Table of Cases</i> | <i>xi</i> |
| <i>Table of Legislation</i> | <i>xv</i> |
| Introduction | 1 |
| Research Questions..... | 4 |
| Findings and Arguments | 5 |
| Scope..... | 6 |
| Choice of Instruments..... | 6 |
| Structure..... | 7 |
| 1. Mutual Recognition: From Passive to Active Recognition..... | 9 |
| Introduction..... | 9 |
| Overview of the Area of Freedom, Security and Justice | 9 |
| Origins of Mutual Recognition | 12 |
| Transfer of Mutual Recognition to the Area of Freedom, Security and Justice..... | 15 |
| Typology and Operation of Mutual Recognition | 18 |
| Development of Mutual Recognition..... | 19 |
| Models of Mutual Recognition | 20 |
| From a Passive to an Active Model of Mutual Recognition..... | 22 |
| Seeking Equivalence and a Role for Proportionality?..... | 24 |
| Conclusion..... | 25 |
| 2. Mutual Trust: From Blind to Gained Trust | 26 |
| Introduction..... | 26 |
| Mutual Trust in the Framework Decision on the European Arrest Warrant..... | 27 |
| Mutual Trust in the Dublin III Regulation..... | 28 |
| Evolution of Trust | 29 |
| Blind Trust..... | 30 |
| The FDEAW | 30 |
| Dublin System..... | 32 |
| Qualified System of Trust | 32 |
| Trust Based on Individual Assessment? | 34 |
| Age of Distrust? | 36 |
| Brexit and Distrust | 36 |
| Rule of Law Crisis and Mutual Trust | 39 |

| | | |
|----|--|----|
| | ECtHR Threshold: Flagrant Denial of Justice..... | 40 |
| | Criticism and Commentary..... | 42 |
| | Grounds for Pragmatic Earned Trust..... | 43 |
| | Conclusion..... | 44 |
| 3. | Deconstructing Proportionality..... | 46 |
| | Introduction..... | 46 |
| | Early Philosophical Foundations..... | 47 |
| | Emergence of a Legal Doctrine..... | 48 |
| | Structure of the Proportionality-based Analysis..... | 52 |
| | Legitimate Objective..... | 52 |
| | Suitability and Necessity..... | 54 |
| | Challenges and Limits..... | 55 |
| | Proportionality in EU Law..... | 58 |
| | Conclusion..... | 61 |
| 4. | The Quest for Balancing in the AFSJ Case Law: Needle in a Haystack..... | 62 |
| | Introduction..... | 62 |
| | Protection of Victims in Criminal Proceedings Case Law..... | 63 |
| | European Arrest Warrant Case Law..... | 64 |
| | <i>Kozłowski; I.B.</i> | 65 |
| | <i>Leyman; Wolzenburg</i> | 66 |
| | <i>Lopes Da Silva</i> | 67 |
| | <i>Jeremy F.</i> | 67 |
| | <i>Radu</i> | 68 |
| | <i>Melloni</i> | 70 |
| | <i>Aranyosi and Căldăraru</i> | 71 |
| | <i>LM</i> and the Essence of the Rights..... | 72 |
| | Remarks..... | 73 |
| | Dublin System Case Law..... | 74 |
| | Conclusion..... | 77 |
| 5. | Constructing Proportionality for the Area of Freedom, Security and Justice..... | 78 |
| | Introduction..... | 78 |
| | Deconstructing EU Fundamental Rights..... | 78 |
| | Fundamental Rights in EU Constitutionalism..... | 79 |
| | The Charter and its Scope of Application..... | 80 |
| | The Place of Fundamental Rights in the AFSJ..... | 84 |
| | Constructing Proportionality for the AFSJ..... | 85 |
| | Criteria on the Relevance of Proportionality Per Se..... | 85 |
| | Article 52(1) of the Charter and the Essence of the Rights..... | 89 |

| | |
|--|-----|
| European Investigation Order and Proportionality..... | 90 |
| Context of Application: Transfers of Individuals Based on Mutual Recognition..... | 91 |
| Generic Balancing Parameters..... | 93 |
| Variable Intensity | 95 |
| Seriousness of the Value Under Restriction..... | 96 |
| Vulnerability of Individuals..... | 97 |
| Degree of Harmonisation | 99 |
| Conclusion..... | 101 |
| | |
| 6. Case Study I: European Arrest Warrant Transfers..... | 102 |
| Introduction..... | 102 |
| EU Criminal Justice: Evolution and Framework in the Context of Mutual Recognition | 104 |
| Security and the Constructed European Public Order..... | 104 |
| Constitutional Framework of EU Criminal Justice..... | 106 |
| Surrender Procedures and Fundamental Rights Breaches | 109 |
| Informing and Applying a Proportionality-based Analysis in the Context of the FDEAW | 115 |
| Disproportionate Requests and Proportionality | 115 |
| The Legality Principle and the Opportunity Principle in Prosecution | 116 |
| Proportionality-based Analysis Informed by the Rights in Question..... | 120 |
| The Principle of <i>Ne Bis in Idem</i> | 121 |
| The Right to be Informed and Defence Rights..... | 123 |
| Right to Appeal..... | 132 |
| Principle of Legality in Criminal Law | 138 |
| Proportionality in Light of <i>Aranyosi</i> : Mission Impossible | 143 |
| Conclusion: The Impact of Proportionality-based Analysis on Surrenders..... | 146 |
| | |
| 7. Case Study II: Dublin Transfers | 149 |
| Introduction..... | 149 |
| Public Discourse and EU Asylum Law | 151 |
| The Common European Asylum System..... | 152 |
| The Institutional and Legal Evolution of the Current Framework on CEAS | 153 |
| Dublin III Regulation..... | 156 |
| Dublin Shortcomings..... | 160 |
| Border and Migration Control as Dominant Narrative..... | 160 |
| Refugee (Governance) Crisis..... | 162 |
| Informing and Applying a Proportionality-based Analysis in the Context of the Dublin III Regulation | 164 |

| | |
|---|-----|
| Proportionality-based Analysis Informed by the Rights in Question | 165 |
| Criteria of Balancing | 173 |
| Impact; the Limits of the Principle of Proportionality | 180 |
| No Place for Proportionality where Absolute Rights are Breached..... | 181 |
| Conclusion | 184 |
| Reflecting and Looking Ahead: Summation of Arguments, the Way Forward and Conclusion | 185 |
| Summation of Arguments | 185 |
| The General Reach of the Argument and its Limits | 187 |
| Variable Impact of Proportionality-based Analysis | 188 |
| The Way Forward for Mutual Trust and Recognition..... | 190 |
| EU Criminal Justice..... | 191 |
| CEAS | 192 |
| The Need for a Consistent Theory of Fundamental Rights for EU Law | 194 |
| Conclusion | 197 |
| <i>Bibliography</i> | 199 |
| <i>Index</i> | 217 |