

PARLAMENTO EUROPEO

2004



2009

Documento de sesión

A6-0186/2009

23.3.2009

INFORME

sobre la aplicación de la Directiva 2004/38/CE relativa al derecho de los ciudadanos de la Unión y de los miembros de sus familias a circular y residir libremente en el territorio de los Estados miembros
(2008/2184(INI))

Comisión de Libertades Civiles, Justicia y Asuntos de Interior

Ponente: Adina-Ioana Vălean

ÍNDICE

	Página
PROPUESTA DE RESOLUCIÓN DEL PARLAMENTO EUROPEO	3
OPINIÓN MINORITARIA	14
OPINIÓN DE LA COMISIÓN DE ASUNTOS JURÍDICOS	15
ANEXO.....	19
RESULTADO DE LA VOTACIÓN FINAL EN COMISIÓN	40

PROPUESTA DE RESOLUCIÓN DEL PARLAMENTO EUROPEO

**sobre la aplicación de la Directiva 2004/38/CE relativa al derecho de los ciudadanos de la Unión y de los miembros de sus familias a circular y residir libremente en el territorio de los Estados miembros
(2008/2184(INI))**

El Parlamento Europeo,

- Vistos el artículo 18 del Tratado CE y el artículo 45 de la Carta de los Derechos Fundamentales de la Unión Europea (la Carta de los Derechos Fundamentales),
- Vista la Directiva 2004/38/CE del Parlamento Europeo y el Consejo, de 29 de abril de 2004, relativa al derecho de los ciudadanos de la Unión y de los miembros de sus familias a circular y residir libremente en el territorio de los Estados miembros¹,
- Vista su Resolución, de 15 de noviembre de 2007, sobre la aplicación de la Directiva 2004/38/CE², que pedía a la Comisión que presentara sin demora una evaluación exhaustiva del estado de la aplicación y la correcta transposición de la Directiva por los Estados miembros, junto con cualquier propuesta necesaria, y encargaba a la comisión competente una evaluación de los problemas que conllevaba la transposición de la Directiva, que destacara las mejores prácticas y las medidas que pueden conducir a discriminaciones entre ciudadanos de la Unión y que abordara el asunto de la libertad de circulación,
- Vista su Resolución, de 4 de diciembre de 2003, sobre la aprobación de medidas relativas a la repatriación de restos mortales³,
- Visto el documento de trabajo de la Comisión de Libertades Civiles, Justicia y Asuntos de Interior de 13 de junio de 2008⁴, el cuestionario remitido a los Parlamentos nacionales de los Estados miembros y las opiniones recibidas,
- Visto el informe sobre la visita a centros de detención cerrados para solicitantes de asilo e inmigrantes en Bélgica⁵ efectuada por una delegación de la Comisión de Libertades Civiles, Justicia y Asuntos de Interior,
- Vista su Resolución, de 5 de febrero de 2009, sobre la aplicación en la Unión Europea de la Directiva 2003/9/CE por la que se aprueban normas mínimas para la acogida de los solicitantes de asilo y los refugiados: visitas de la Comisión de Libertades Civiles, Justicia y Asuntos de Interior de 2005 a 2008⁶,

¹ DO L 158 de 30.4.2004, pp. 77.

² DO C 282 E de 6.11.2008, p. 428.

³ DO C 89 E de 14.04.2004, p. 162.

⁴ PE407.933v01-00.

⁵ PE404.465v02-00.

⁶ Textos adoptados, P6_TA(2009)0361.

- Vistos su Resolución, de 10 de julio de 2008, sobre el censo de la población romaní en Italia sobre la base del origen étnico¹, el dictamen de su Servicio Jurídico sobre la compatibilidad de agravar las circunstancias de los ciudadanos de la UE que se encuentran en situación ilegal en otro Estado miembro de la UE, y el informe de su Comisión de Libertades Civiles, Justicia y Asuntos del Interior sobre la visita de una delegación a Italia,
 - Visto el informe de la Comisión, de 15 de febrero de 2008, titulado «Quinto informe sobre la ciudadanía de la Unión (1 de mayo de 2004 - 30 de junio de 2007)» (COM(2008)0085),
 - Visto el Vigésimo quinto informe anual de la Comisión, de 18 de noviembre de 2008, sobre el control de la aplicación del Derecho comunitario (2007)(COM(2008)0777),
 - Vista la Resolución de ... de abril de 2009 sobre los problemas y perspectivas de la ciudadanía europea²,
 - Visto el informe de la Agencia Europea de los Derechos Fundamentales titulado «Homofobia y discriminación por razones de orientación sexual en los Estados miembros»,
 - Visto el informe de la Comisión, de 10 de diciembre de 2008, sobre la aplicación de la Directiva 2004/38/CE relativa al derecho de los ciudadanos de la Unión y de los miembros de sus familias a circular y residir libremente en el territorio de los Estados miembros (COM(2008)0840) (informe de la Comisión),
 - Vistas las conclusiones del Consejo de Justicia y Asuntos de Interior, de 27 de noviembre de 2008, sobre «Libre circulación de las personas: abusos y usos indebidos del derecho a la libre circulación de personas»,
 - Vistas las sentencias del Tribunal de Justicia Europeo (TJE) relativas a la libre circulación de personas, como las correspondientes a los asuntos C-127/08 (asunto Metock), C-33/07 (asunto Jipa) y C-524/06 (asunto Huber),
 - Visto el informe provisional titulado «Estudio comparativo sobre la aplicación de la Directiva 2004/38/EC relativa al derecho de los ciudadanos de la Unión y de los miembros de sus familias a circular y residir libremente en el territorio de los Estados miembros» solicitado por la Comisión de Asunto Jurídicos y elaborado por el Servicio Europeo de Acción Ciudadana (ECAS),
 - Visto el artículo 45 de su Reglamento,
 - Visto el informe de la Comisión de Libertades Civiles, Justicia e Asuntos de Interior y el dictamen de la Comisión de Asuntos Jurídicos (A6-0186/2009),
- A. Considerando que de conformidad con el Quinto informe sobre la ciudadanía de la Unión, a 1 de enero de 2006 aproximadamente 8,2 millones de ciudadanos de la Unión

¹ Textos adoptados, P6_TA(2008)0361.

² Textos adoptados, P6_TA(2009)XXXX.

ejercían su derecho a residir en otro Estado miembro y millones de ciudadanos de la Unión se desplazaban cada año en el interior de la Unión,

- B. Considerando que la libertad de circulación es inherente a los conceptos de derechos humanos y ciudadanía de la Unión y representa uno de los derechos y libertades fundamentales reconocidos a los ciudadanos de la Unión por los Tratados,
- C. Considerando que la Directiva 2004/38/CE aplica los principios consagrados en los Tratados al establecer que los ciudadanos de la Unión puedan circular libremente por toda la Unión, junto con los miembros de sus familias, independientemente de su país de origen,
- D. Considerando que los Estados miembros estaban obligados a transponer la Directiva 2004/38/CE antes del 30 de abril de 2006, y que la Comisión debía emitir su informe sobre la aplicación de la Directiva el 30 de abril de 2008,
- E. Considerando que, casi cinco años después de la adopción de la Directiva 2004/38/CE, finalmente empieza a estar disponible la información sobre su transposición y aplicación práctica, aunque con cierto retraso respecto a los plazos establecidos en la Directiva,
- F. Considerando que el Parlamento ha expresado en repetidas ocasiones su preocupación por la manera en que algunos Estados miembros aplican la libertad de circulación,
- G. Considerando que recientemente se inició un diálogo entre la Comisión, el Parlamento y algunos Estados miembros,
- H. Considerando que este diálogo ha permitido que se modificara la legislación nacional hasta cierto punto para que fuera conforme con la legislación comunitaria,
- I. Considerando que de acuerdo con el informe de la Comisión, la transposición general de la Directiva 2004/38/CE es muy desalentadora, ya que ningún Estado miembro ha transpuesto la Directiva de manera efectiva y correcta en su totalidad y, además, ninguno de los artículos de la Directiva ha sido transpuesto de manera efectiva y correcta por todos los Estados miembros;
- J. Considerando que el informe de la Comisión señala, entre otras muchas, dos infracciones persistentes de los derechos fundamentales de los ciudadanos de la Unión, en particular el derecho de entrada y residencia de los miembros de las familias de terceros países y la exigencia de que los ciudadanos de la Unión adjunten a las solicitudes de residencia documentos adicionales, como permisos de trabajo y justificantes de que se dispone de un alojamiento adecuado, no contemplados en la Directiva 2004/38/CE,
- K. Considerando que la Comisión hasta la fecha ha recibido más de 1 800 denuncias individuales, 40 preguntas del Parlamento y 33 peticiones, y ha registrado a este respecto 115 denuncias y ha iniciado 5 procedimientos de infracción por la aplicación incorrecta de la Directiva 2004/38/CE,
- L. Considerando que la Comisión opina en su informe que no hay necesidad de modificar la Directiva 2004/38/CE en estos momentos, pero que no deben escatimarse esfuerzos para

conseguir su correcta aplicación, a través de la creación de un grupo de expertos, la recogida de información, datos y mejores prácticas mediante un cuestionario, y la elaboración en 2009 de unas directrices sobre asuntos problemáticos para garantizar su plena y correcta aplicación,

- M. Considerando que varios Parlamentos nacionales han contestado el cuestionario de la Comisión de Libertades Civiles, Justicia y Asuntos de Interior¹ mientras que en algunos Estados miembros contestaron el cuestionario ambas cámaras parlamentarias²,
- N. Considerando que los representantes de los Parlamentos nacionales tuvieron la oportunidad de expresar con mayor detalle sus opiniones en la Reunión conjunta sobre progresos en el espacio de libertad, seguridad y justicia, que tuvo lugar los días 19 y 20 de enero de 2009,
- O. Considerando que el Servicio Jurídico del Parlamento, al que la Comisión de Libertades Civiles, Justicia y Asuntos de Interior consultó sobre este asunto, concluyó que las disposiciones pertinentes del Derecho comunitario se oponen a una legislación nacional que considere circunstancia agravante de un crimen o delito cometido el mero hecho de que la persona en cuestión sea ciudadana de un Estado miembro que resida ilegalmente en el territorio de otro Estado miembro,
- P. Considerando que las sentencias del Tribunal de Justicia Europeo en materia de libertad de circulación y en particular en los asuntos Metock, Jipa y Huber reiteraron los siguientes principios:
- El nacional de un tercer país, cónyuge de un ciudadano de la Unión, que acompaña o se reúne con este ciudadano puede acogerse a las disposiciones de esa Directiva, independientemente del momento o del lugar en el que hubieran contraído matrimonio y sin necesidad de haber residido antes legalmente en ese país³,
 - El artículo 18 del Tratado CE y el artículo 27 de la Directiva 2004/38/CE no se oponen a que la legislación nacional permita restringir el derecho de un nacional de un Estado miembro a trasladarse al territorio de otro Estado miembro, en particular por haber sido repatriado anteriormente del mismo debido a que se encontraba en él en «situación ilegal», siempre que la conducta personal de ese nacional constituya una amenaza real, actual y suficientemente grave contra intereses fundamentales de la sociedad y que la medida restrictiva prevista sea apropiada para garantizar la consecución del objetivo que persigue y no vaya más allá de lo que sea necesario para alcanzarlo; corresponde al órgano jurisdiccional nacional establecer si ello es así en el asunto del que conoce⁴;
 - El apartado 1 del artículo 12 del Tratado CE debe interpretarse en el sentido de que excluye la posibilidad de que un Estado miembro instaure, a los efectos de la lucha

¹ Austria, Bélgica, Chipre, República Checa, Grecia, España, Italia, Lituania, Polonia, Rumanía, Eslovenia y Eslovaquia.

² Bélgica, República Checa y Rumanía.

³ Asunto Metock.

⁴ Asunto Jipa.

contra la delincuencia, un sistema de tratamiento de datos de carácter personal específico para ciudadanos de la Unión no nacionales de dicho Estado miembro¹,

- Q. Considerando que el mencionado informe sobre la visita a los centros cerrados para solicitantes de asilo e inmigrantes de Bélgica exponía que «la detención de ciudadanos comunitarios en centros de internamiento para residentes de países terceros en situación irregular parece chocante y desproporcionada, en particular si es cierto que se justifica por simples infracciones administrativas. Las cifras aportadas por las autoridades belgas son, en este sentido, especialmente preocupantes»;
- R. Considerando que en las conclusiones de 27 de noviembre de 2008 mencionadas, el Consejo de Justicia y Asuntos de Interior solicitó a la Comisión que emitiera una declaración interpretativa con directrices sobre el funcionamiento de la Directiva 2004/38/ES a principios de 2009 y que tuviera en cuenta todas las demás medidas oportunas y necesarias,
- S. Considerando que según la información recabada, principalmente a través de las respuestas de los Parlamentos nacionales al cuestionario del Parlamento Europeo, que lamentablemente no es exhaustivo y no cubría todos los Estados miembros, y, además de lo tratado en el informe de la Comisión, se hallaron problemáticas las siguientes cuestiones principales:
- la interpretación restrictiva por los Estados miembros del concepto de «miembro de familia» (artículo 2), «cualquier otro miembro de la familia» y «la pareja» (artículo 3), en particular en relación con las parejas del mismo sexo, y su derecho a la libre circulación con arreglo a la Directiva 2004/38/CE²;
 - se imponen cargas administrativas injustificadas respecto a la entrada y residencia de los miembros de familia de terceros países³;

¹ Asunto Huber.

² CY, PL y SK no reconocen los matrimonios entre personas del mismo sexo como motivo para otorgar derechos de libre circulación, y PL y SK no reconocen las uniones registradas aunque hayan sido certificadas en otros Estados miembros. La información a este respecto facilitada por la Comisión, la ADF y las ONG prueba en mayor medida la incertidumbre legal sobre esta cuestión; Italia no reconoce los derechos de las parejas del mismo sexo a la libertad de circulación por motivos de orden público. Existe una tendencia general a no reconocer a terceros o cuartos cónyuges.

³ Varias cartas de reclamación y peticiones dirigidas a las instituciones europeas señalan que algunos Estados miembros son reacios a reconocer plenamente los derechos de los miembros de familia de terceros países. A modo de ejemplo, la legislación lituana, la polaca y la del Reino Unido se oponen a la entrada sin visado de un miembro de familia no comunitario. Grecia considera el nivel de «pensión mínima» como ingresos necesarios; Toma nota de que los obstáculos jurídicos y administrativos que afectan a miembros de una familia procedentes de terceros países son muy problemáticos; señala que, en violación de la Directiva, la legislación del Reino Unido impide que un miembro de la familia, procedente de un país tercero, que tiene un permiso de residencia expedido por otro país, entre en el país sin un visado, y que las prácticas administrativas del Reino Unido son de tal naturaleza que las largas demoras y la amplia documentación requerida en la tramitación de las solicitudes de permisos de residencia para miembros de la familia que sean nacionales de terceros países también constituyen importantes obstáculos para el ejercicio de los derechos de libre circulación; llama la atención sobre el hecho de que, en Estonia, los nacionales de terceros países se enfrentan a problemas al intentar entrar en el país con un permiso de residencia expedido por otro Estado miembro, y que a los miembros de una familia procedentes de un país tercero que soliciten un visado se les pide también que paguen las tasas de tramitación del visado; señala

- la interpretación por los Estados miembros de «recursos suficientes» en virtud del artículo 7, apartado 1, letra b), de la Directiva 2004/38/CE es con frecuencia confusa, ya que la mayoría de los Estados miembros exige la acreditación de dichos recursos; el concepto de «carga excesiva para la asistencia social del Estado miembro de acogida» y los casos en que la decisión de expulsar a un ciudadano de la Unión que ha pasado a ser una carga excesiva (considerando 10, artículo 14) también es incierto en muchos Estados miembros¹;
- la interpretación por los Estados miembros de la expresión «por motivos imperiosos de orden público y seguridad pública», y los casos y los motivos que pueden justificar una orden de expulsión (artículos 27 y 28) varían de un Estado miembro a otro, son confusos y podrían dar lugar a abusos (tomar por objetivo a los ciudadanos de un Estado miembro determinado) o despiertan dudas sobre su conformidad con la Directiva 2004/38/CE (por ejemplo, los mecanismos automáticos de expulsión)²;
- con frecuencia se obliga a los ciudadanos de la Unión a presentar a las autoridades del Estado miembro de acogida documentos adicionales injustificados no contemplados en la Directiva 2004/38/CE³;
- el Derecho y la práctica en relación con el abuso de los derechos y los matrimonios de conveniencia,

T. Considerando que en algunos Estados miembros existen diferencias importantes en materia de documentación de identidad entre los ciudadanos nacionales y los ciudadanos de la Unión provenientes de otro Estado miembro, a los que les resulta difícil probar su condición de ciudadanos de la Unión residentes dificultando así seriamente en la práctica el ejercicio de sus derechos y su integración en la vida social y mercantil,

U. Considerando que la transposición incorrecta de la Directiva 2004/38/CE por la que los Estados miembros aplican el artículo 18 del Tratado CE debería condenarse con firmeza, y considerando que esta situación da lugar a la inaplicación de uno de los derechos esenciales en los que se fundamenta la Unión Europea y que los Tratados confieren a los ciudadanos de la Unión, si no socava a la Directiva en sí,

V. Considerando que, de conformidad con la Comunicación de la Comisión de 18 de noviembre de 2008 sobre las repercusiones de la libre circulación de trabajadores en el

que, en Italia, a un nacional de un país tercero que solicita la reunificación familiar se le exige que demuestre la legalidad del origen de sus recursos económicos, cuyo importe no podrá ser inferior al subsidio social anual;

¹Por ejemplo, en relación con la legislación italiana que obliga a los ciudadanos de la UE a probar la autenticidad de sus recursos suficientes;

² Por ejemplo, el artículo 235 del Código Penal italiano contempla la expulsión de los no nacionales condenados a 2 o más años de prisión.

³ En algunos casos (Grecia), el Derecho nacional permite a las autoridades competentes pedir los antecedentes penales del ciudadano de la UE que solicita su registro, mientras que en otros Estados miembros (por ejemplo en España y Bélgica), se expiden carnés de identidad y tarjetas de residencia especiales para nacionales de otros Estados; en algunos Estados miembros (ES), además del certificado de registro, los ciudadanos de la Unión disponen de un Número de Identificación de Extranjeros que es necesario para trabajar o darse de alta en la Seguridad Social; en Italia se exige a los ciudadanos de la Unión que acrediten la «legalidad» de sus recursos.

contexto de la ampliación de la Unión Europea (COM(2008)0765)durante la primera fase de aplicación (1 de enero de 2007 – 31 de diciembre de 2008) de las disposiciones transitorias, los trabajadores móviles de los países que se adhirieron a la UE en 2004 y 2007 han tenido un impacto positivo en las economías de los Estados miembros,

- W. Considerando que cuatro Estados miembros de la UE-15 no han abierto sus mercados de trabajo a los trabajadores de los Estados miembros de la UE-8,
- X. Considerando que once Estados miembros han comunicado a la Comisión su decisión de continuar aplicando restricciones en sus respectivos mercados de trabajo a los nacionales de Rumania y Bulgaria a partir del 1 de enero de 2009,

Aplicación de la Directiva 2004/38/CE

1. Insta a los Estados miembros a que respeten el espíritu y la letra del artículo 18 del Tratado CE y el artículo 45 de la Carta de los Derechos Fundamentales, que reconocen a los ciudadanos de la Unión el derecho fundamental a la libre circulación, mediante la aplicación de la Directiva 2004/38/CE con carácter exhaustivo y de urgencia, y la revisión y modificación sin demora de la legislación y de las prácticas administrativas contrarias al Derecho comunitario, en particular basándose en el informe de la Comisión y en la jurisprudencia del TJE; toma nota de que diversas disposiciones de la legislación de la mayoría de los Estados miembros son contrarios a la letra y al espíritu de la Directiva, lo que socava los derechos de libre circulación y ciudadanía de la UE, y que las prácticas administrativas nacionales a menudo constituyen importantes obstáculos al ejercicio por parte de los ciudadanos de sus derechos;
2. Insta a los Estados miembros a que vean por el pleno ejercicio de los derechos reconocidos por los artículos 2 y 3 de la Directiva 2004/38/CE, no solo a los cónyuges de distinto sexo, sino también a las parejas registradas, los miembros de la familia y las parejas del mismo sexo reconocidas por un Estado miembro, independientemente de su nacionalidad y sin perjuicio de su no reconocimiento por otro Estado miembro, de conformidad con los principios de reconocimiento mutuo, igualdad, no discriminación, dignidad, y vida privada y familiar; pide a los Estados miembros que tengan presente que la Directiva impone la obligación de reconocer la libre circulación de todo ciudadano de la Unión (incluidas las parejas del mismo sexo) sin imponer el reconocimiento del matrimonio entre cónyuges del mismo sexo; a este respecto, insta a la Comisión a que emita unas directrices estrictas, elabore el análisis y las conclusiones contenidas en el informe de la Agencia de los Derechos Fundamentales y efectúe un seguimiento de estos asuntos;
3. Pide a la Comisión que presente las propuestas apropiadas, en el marco del programa de Estocolmo, para garantizar la libre circulación sin discriminación basada en las razones mencionadas en el artículo 13 del Tratado CE, basándose en el análisis y las conclusiones contenidos en el informe de la Agencia de los Derechos Fundamentales;
4. Insta a los Estados miembros a que, a la hora de aplicar el derecho a la libre circulación y residencia, no impongan cargas administrativas excesivas a los ciudadanos de la Unión y a

los miembros de sus familias, incluidos los miembros de la familia de terceros países, que no estén explícitamente contempladas en la Directiva 2004/38/CE, ya que son contrarias al Derecho comunitario y representan un obstáculo injustificado al ejercicio de una libertad conferida directamente por el Tratado CE, que no depende de la formalización de trámites administrativos; recuerda a los Estados miembros su deber de facilitar las prácticas administrativas vinculadas al ejercicio del derecho a la libre circulación, y les pide que procedan a un seguimiento e informen sobre todas las decisiones administrativas y judiciales basadas en el artículo 3, apartado 2, de la Directiva; recuerda a los Estados miembros su obligación de facilitar la entrada de miembros de la familia de terceros países de ciudadanos de la Unión, para permitir que lleven una vida familiar normal en el Estado miembro de acogida;

5. Pide a los Estados miembros que equiparen, en los casos donde exista, el formato de la documentación personal de identidad de sus nacionales y de los ciudadanos de la Unión procedentes de otros Estados miembros, sin perjuicio de las diferencias que se hagan constar en su contenido¹;
6. Pide a la Comisión que evalúe detenidamente los derechos y las prácticas de los Estados miembros para comprobar que no infringen los derechos conferidos a los ciudadanos de la Unión por el Tratado CE y la Directiva, en particular en relación con los conceptos de «recursos suficientes», «carga excesiva para el sistema de asistencia social del Estado de acogida», «motivos imperiosos de orden público y seguridad pública», y que las garantías sustantivas y procesales, así como el amparo y la reparación judicial contra las expulsiones están debidamente en vigor y operativas; recuerda que debe interpretarse con criterio restrictivo cualquier limitación del derecho fundamental de libre circulación;
7. Toma nota de que los nacionales de determinados Estados miembros y pertenecientes a comunidades étnicas parecen ser objeto de atención específica en algunos Estados miembros, y subraya que la Directiva 2004/38/CE se debe aplicar sin discriminaciones entre ciudadanos de la Unión y miembros de su familia basadas en cualquiera de los motivos enumerados en el artículo 21 de la Carta de los Derechos Fundamentales; pide a la Comisión, el Consejo y todos los Estados miembros que garanticen y vele en particular por que no se produzca discriminación alguna basada en nacionalidad, raza u origen étnico, ya sea en la práctica o en la legislación;
8. Observa que las medidas tomadas por razones de orden público o de seguridad pública han de cumplir el principio de proporcionalidad y basarse exclusivamente en la conducta personal del individuo en cuestión; tal conducta personal debe representar una amenaza auténtica, efectiva y suficientemente grave que afecte a un interés fundamental de la

¹ La prácticas administrativas no conformes con el Derecho comunitario tiene graves repercusiones negativas en los derechos de los ciudadanos. Llama la atención, a modo de ejemplo, sobre la proliferación de diferentes documentos de identidad y tarjetas de residencia en los Estados miembros, con el resultado de que el ejercicio por parte de los ciudadanos de la UE de su derecho a la libre circulación es confuso y fastidioso; señala que, en España, además del certificado de registro, a los ciudadanos de la UE se les asigna un Número de Identidad de Extranjero, necesario para trabajar o inscribirse en el sistema español de Seguridad Social, que Francia también ha mantenido un ambiguo permiso de residencia voluntario en paralelo con el certificado de registro expedido a los ciudadanos de la Unión y que, en algunos Estados miembros como la República Checa, Suecia y Bélgica, las autoridades exigen otros documentos para expedir permisos de residencia o imponen condiciones que no figuran en la Directiva;

- sociedad; pide a este respecto a los Estados miembros que revisen sistemáticamente las alertas nacionales sobre denegaciones de entrada a ciudadanos de la Unión y miembros de sus familias¹; recuerda que no pueden invocarse excepciones a las políticas públicas con fines económicos o para perseguir objetivos generales de prevención;
9. Señala que no todos los Estados miembros han aplicado el artículo 35 de la Directiva 2004/38/CE, que les permite adoptar las medidas necesarias para denegar, cesar o retirar los derechos de libre circulación en los casos de abuso de derechos o fraude, como los matrimonios de conveniencia, siempre que tales medidas sean proporcionadas y no discriminatorias y que se respeten las garantías procesales, y llama la atención sobre las posibilidades establecidas en este artículo;
 10. Insta a la Comisión a que supervise el cumplimiento en la práctica del artículo 24 de la Directiva 2004/38/CE sobre igualdad de trato y la prohibición de la discriminación por motivos de nacionalidad, en combinación con los considerandos 20 y 31 y el artículo 21 de la Carta de los Derechos Fundamentales, que otorgan a los ciudadanos de la Unión y a los miembros de sus familias que se trasladan a otro Estado miembro, el derecho a la igualdad de trato con los nacionales de ese Estado miembro en todos los asuntos que inciden en el ámbito de aplicación del Tratado CE, e insta a los Estados miembros a que tomen con la mayor premura las medidas necesarias para superar las insuficiencias y para poner término sin demora a las infracciones del Derecho comunitario;
 11. Pide la revisión de las disposiciones transitorias que siguen limitando la libre circulación de los nacionales de los Estados miembros que se adhirieron a la UE el 1 de mayo de 2004 y el 1 de enero de 2007, y que representan una discriminación sustancial y perjudicial entre los ciudadanos de la Unión; opina que la cláusula preferencial se ha de aplicar a todos los ciudadanos de la Unión y que se ha de completar la creación del mercado único;
 12. pide a la Comisión y a los Estados miembros que, en la aplicación de la Directiva 2004/38/CE, consideren los efectos discriminatorios potenciales de los reglamentos sobre seguridad social y acceso a los servicios de interés general que pudieran constituir obstáculos a la libre circulación;
 13. Pide al Consejo que defina una estrategia para garantizar la libre circulación de los ciudadanos y de los trabajadores de la Unión y su acceso al mercado de trabajo en los Estados miembros de acogida y para dar a conocer los logros y los efectos de la libre circulación de los ciudadanos y de los trabajadores en los Estados miembros de acogida y para la UE; pide a la Comisión que ponga en marcha un estudio para identificar las circunstancias actuales y futuras de escasez de mano de obra en la UE y la contribución potencial al crecimiento económico sostenido que pueden aportar los trabajadores de

¹ Las leyes de Estonia y Hungría no prevén expresamente la exclusión de los fines económicos al imponer una orden de expulsión. En las normativas húngara y rumana no hay ninguna referencia a la exclusión de condenas penales previas ni de objetivos preventivos generales.

todos los Estados miembros con pleno acceso al mercado de trabajo de la UE;

14. Insta a la Comisión y a los Estados miembros a que revisen las limitaciones, restricciones y períodos de tiempo actuales contemplados en la Directiva 2004/38/CE para el disfrute del derecho a la libertad de circulación de acuerdo con lo dispuesto en el artículo 39 de la Directiva 2004/38/CE y a que analicen las consecuencias de la eliminación de la discriminación actual entre los ciudadanos de la Unión en términos del pleno disfrute de los derechos de libre circulación y los derechos de la ciudadanía de la Unión conferidos por el Tratado;

Metodología para garantizar la aplicación

15. Toma nota de que la deficiente transposición de la Directiva 2004/38/CE demuestra que la Comisión no ha sido capaz de garantizar un cumplimiento coherente y oportuno de la Directiva por los Estados miembros ni de gestionar el gran número de quejas de los ciudadanos en relación con la aplicación de la Directiva;
16. Apoya el enfoque propuesto por la Comisión, basado en la supervisión continuada y exhaustiva de la aplicación de la Directiva 2004/38/CE, en la asistencia proporcionada a los Estados para que garanticen la plena y correcta aplicación de la Directiva a través de la elaboración de directrices en el primer semestre de 2009, y en iniciar procedimientos contra los Estados miembros en los casos en que sus Derechos nacionales y/o prácticas entren en conflicto con la Directiva; pide a la Comisión que desarrolle y presente al Parlamento una política de aplicación coherente, eficaz y transparente que garantice la aplicación del derecho a la libre circulación; considera que la falta de recursos humanos y financieros asignados en la Comisión para hacer frente a la transposición y la aplicación de la Directiva constituye un grave obstáculo para la capacidad de la Comisión de controlar de modo creíble la aplicación de la Directiva en todos los Estados miembros y, por tanto, la unidad de la ley en esa materia que es tan crucial para los ciudadanos de la UE;
17. Insta a los Estados miembros a que inicien los trámites para aplicar las directrices a finales de 2009 con objeto de adaptar sus legislaciones y prácticas nacionales, y les insta a que proporcionen las directrices a todas las autoridades competentes y supervisen su aplicación;
18. Pide a la Comisión que detalle en sus directrices criterios comunes para establecer la cantidad mínima considerada como recursos suficientes y que aclare sobre qué base los Estados miembros deben tener en cuenta «la situación personal de la persona en cuestión», de conformidad con el artículo 8, apartado 4, de la Directiva 2004/38/CE;
19. Pide a la Comisión que desarrolle en sus directrices un mecanismo uniforme de interpretación de las categorías normativas de «orden público», «seguridad pública» y «salud pública», y que aclare de qué manera unas consideraciones como el período de residencia, la edad, el estado de salud, la familia y la situación económica, la integración social y cultural, y los vínculos con el país de origen son pertinentes para la decisión de expulsión prevista en el artículo 28, apartado 1, de la Directiva 2004/38/CE;
20. Reconoce las restricciones de la repatriación de restos mortales de ciudadanos de la

Unión y pide a la Comisión que presente un código de conducta al cual los Estados miembros pudieran adherirse, para asegurarse de que es un corolario a la libre circulación de los ciudadanos;

21. Pide a la Comisión que aumente los fondos y cree una línea presupuestaria específica para apoyar los proyectos nacionales y locales dirigidos a la integración de ciudadanos de la Unión y los miembros de su familia, según lo definido por los artículos 2 y 3 de la Directiva 2004/38/CE, residentes en otro Estado miembro;
22. Pide a la Comisión que fije un plazo para la aplicación de las directrices, tras el cual se podrían incoar procedimientos, y pide participar plenamente y que se le informe periódicamente de los avances del proceso;
23. Insta a la Comisión a que establezca, respecto a la libre circulación de personas, un sistema de evaluación mutuo a cargo de equipos formados por expertos designados por los Estados miembros y el Parlamento, con la ayuda de la Comisión y de la Secretaría General del Consejo, basado en visitas in situ, y que no invada las competencias que los Tratados confían a la Comisión;
24. Insta a la Comisión a que solicite a los Estados miembros informes periódicos que contengan datos estadísticos sobre la libertad de circulación, por ejemplo sobre el número de ocasiones en que se hayan denegado derechos de entrada y residencia y de expulsiones llevadas a cabo y sus motivos;
25. Pide a los Estados miembros que ayuden a sus nacionales residentes en otros Estados miembros ofreciendo en sus misiones consulares y diplomáticas toda la información necesaria sobre la libre circulación;
26. Pide a la Comisión que verifique la existencia, en los Estados miembros, de sistemas para tratar datos personales específicos de ciudadanos de la Unión que no sean nacionales de ese Estado miembro y si contienen solamente los datos necesarios para aplicar la Directiva 2004/38/CE y la legislación nacional de transposición; le pide también que verifique si existen sistemas similares con el fin de luchar contra la delincuencia, y pide a aquellos Estados miembros que dispongan de tales sistemas que los revisen, conforme al asunto Huber;
27. Pide a aquellos Estados miembros que dispongan de leyes no compatibles con el asunto Metock que las revisen urgentemente, y pide a la Comisión que incoe procedimientos contra ellos en caso de incumplimiento;
28. Acoge favorablemente la intención de la Comisión de mejorar la concienciación de los ciudadanos de la Unión respecto a sus derechos en virtud de la Directiva 2004/38/CE, y de distribuir una guía simplificada para los ciudadanos de la Unión, sacando el mayor provecho de Internet; recuerda a los Estados miembros sus deberes de información a los ciudadanos sobre los derechos que tienen en relación con la libre circulación, según lo dispuesto en el artículo 34 de la Directiva; a este respecto, insta a los Estados miembros a que establezcan oficinas de información y asistencia en relación con los derechos de libre circulación;

o

o o

29. Encarga a su Presidente que transmita la presente Resolución al Consejo, a la Comisión y a los Gobiernos y Parlamentos de los Estados miembros.

OPINIÓN MINORITARIA

presentada por Roberta Angelilli y Mario Borghezio
(Art. 48 del Reglamento del Parlamento)

AL INFORME VALEAN

sobre la aplicación de la Directiva 2004/38/CE relativa al derecho de los ciudadanos de la Unión y de los miembros de sus familias a circular y residir libremente en el territorio de los Estados miembros

-Aún reafirmando enérgicamente la importancia de la Directiva 2004/38/CE, y haciendo hincapié en la necesidad de garantizar, a través de ella, la libertad de circulación de los ciudadanos de la UE;

- No compartimos el enfoque del informe porque considera materias que son de la exclusiva competencia de los Estados miembros, especialmente el derecho de familia, el derecho penal y el orden público; ;

- Es por tanto inaceptable la observación contenida en el informe (considerando S) con referencia a una supuesta "interpretación restrictiva" por los Estados miembros de los conceptos de "familia", "cualquier otro miembro de la familia" y "pareja". En esta observación se critica la "prevalencia de las posiciones contrarias al reconocimiento de la tercera y cuarta esposas" y proponiendo así una interpretación amplia y equívoca de la Directiva 2004/38/CE que facilitará la práctica fraudulenta de los matrimonios ficticios o incluso el paradójico reconocimiento de la legitimidad de la poligamia.

13.2.2009

OPINIÓN DE LA COMISIÓN DE ASUNTOS JURÍDICOS

para la Comisión de Libertades Civiles, Justicia y Asuntos de Interior

sobre la aplicación de la Directiva 2004/38/CE relativa al derecho de los ciudadanos de la Unión y de los miembros de sus familias a circular y residir libremente en el territorio de los Estados miembros
(2008/2184(INI))

Ponente de opinión: Monica Frassoni

SUGERENCIAS

La Comisión de Asuntos Jurídicos pide a la Comisión de Libertades Civiles, Justicia y Asuntos de Interior, competente para el fondo, que incorpore las siguientes sugerencias en la propuesta de resolución que apruebe:

- A. Considerando que ha de prestarse atención al informe provisional del «Estudio comparativo sobre la aplicación de la Directiva 2004/38/EC relativa al derecho de los ciudadanos de la Unión y de los miembros de sus familias a circular y residir libremente en el territorio de los Estados miembros», solicitado por la Comisión de Asunto Jurídicos y elaborado por el Servicio Europeo de Acción Ciudadana (ECAS),
1. Toma nota de que diversas disposiciones de la legislación de la mayoría de los Estados miembros son contrarios a la letra y al espíritu de la Directiva, lo que socava los derechos de libre circulación y ciudadanía de la UE, y que las prácticas administrativas nacionales a menudo constituyen importantes obstáculos al ejercicio por parte de los ciudadanos de sus derechos;
2. Observa con decepción que sólo se ha transpuesto satisfactoriamente la Directiva en Chipre, Grecia, Finlandia, Luxemburgo, Malta, Portugal y España;
3. Señala que esto demuestra que la Comisión ha sido incapaz de garantizar un cumplimiento coherente y oportuno de la Directiva por los Estados miembros y de tratar el gran número de quejas de los ciudadanos en relación con la aplicación de la Directiva; pide a la Comisión que elabore y presente al Parlamento una política de aplicación coherente, eficaz y transparente que garantice la aplicación del derecho a la libre circulación; considera que la falta de recursos humanos y financieros asignados en la Comisión para hacer frente a la transposición y la aplicación de la Directiva constituye un grave

obstáculo para la capacidad de la Comisión de controlar de modo creíble la aplicación de la Directiva en todos los Estados miembros y, por tanto, la unidad de la ley en esa materia que es tan crucial para los ciudadanos de la UE;

4. Considera que la incorrecta aplicación de la Directiva por parte de los Estados miembros obliga a considerar la posibilidad de modificar las disposiciones más problemáticas, a saber, el derecho de entrada y de residencia de miembros de una familia que son ciudadanos de terceros países y la exigencia para los ciudadanos de la UE de presentar, junto con las solicitudes de residencia, documentos adicionales no previstos en la Directiva;
5. Toma nota de los importantes efectos negativos para los derechos de los ciudadanos de las prácticas administrativas que no son conformes al Derecho comunitario; llama la atención, a modo de ejemplo, sobre la proliferación de diferentes documentos de identidad y tarjetas de residencia en los Estados miembros, con el resultado de que el ejercicio por parte de los ciudadanos de la UE de su derecho a la libre circulación es confuso y fastidioso; señala que, en España, además del certificado de registro, a los ciudadanos de la UE se les asigna un Número de Identidad de Extranjero, necesario para trabajar o inscribirse en el sistema español de Seguridad Social, que Francia también ha mantenido un ambiguo permiso de residencia voluntario en paralelo con el certificado de registro expedido a los ciudadanos de la Unión y que, en algunos Estados miembros como la República Checa, Suecia y Bélgica, las autoridades exigen otros documentos para expedir permisos de residencia o imponen condiciones que no figuran en la Directiva;
6. Toma nota de que la transposición del principio de los «recursos suficientes» en los Estados miembros da lugar a confusión entre los ciudadanos de la UE, ya que se definen con frecuencia de modo ambiguo en la legislación nacional a todos los niveles; señala que esto provoca una profunda preocupación, por ejemplo en relación con la legislación italiana que obliga a los ciudadanos de la UE a probar la autenticidad de sus recursos suficientes;
7. Toma nota de que la situación de las parejas de hecho registradas que se benefician de la Directiva no siempre es clara, especialmente en aquellos países que no reconocen a las parejas de hecho registradas; pide a la Comisión que controle cuidadosamente este importante aspecto de la Directiva;
8. Toma nota de que los obstáculos jurídicos y administrativos que afectan a miembros de una familia procedentes de terceros países son muy problemáticos; señala que, en violación de la Directiva, la legislación del Reino Unido impide que un miembro de la familia, procedente de un país tercero, que tiene un permiso de residencia expedido por otro país, entre en el país sin un visado, y que las prácticas administrativas del Reino Unido son de tal naturaleza que las largas demoras y la amplia documentación requerida en la tramitación de las solicitudes de permisos de residencia para miembros de la familia que sean nacionales de terceros países también constituyen importantes obstáculos para el ejercicio de los derechos de libre circulación; llama la atención sobre el hecho de que, en Estonia, los nacionales de terceros países se enfrentan a problemas al intentar entrar en el país con un permiso de residencia expedido por otro Estado miembro, y que a los miembros de una familia procedentes de un país tercero que soliciten un visado se les pide

también que paguen las tasas de tramitación del visado; señala que, en Italia, a un nacional de un país tercero que solicita la reunificación familiar se le exige que demuestre la legalidad del origen de sus recursos económicos, cuyo importe no podrá ser inferior al subsidio social anual;

9. Recuerda que las excepciones a la política pública no pueden ser invocadas con fines económicos o para perseguir objetivos generales de prevención; señala la ausencia en la legislación estonia y húngara de una referencia clara a la exclusión de los fines económicos para imponer una orden de expulsión y la ausencia, en la legislación húngara y rumana, de toda referencia a la exclusión de las condenas penales anteriores y los objetivos generales de prevención.

RESULTADO DE LA VOTACIÓN FINAL EN COMISIÓN

Fecha de aprobación	12.2.2009
Resultado de la votación final	+: -: 0:
Miembros presentes en la votación final	Alin Lucian Antochi, Monica Frassoni, Lidia Joanna Geringer de Oedenberg, Klaus-Heiner Lehne, Alain Lipietz, Manuel Medina Ortega, Aloyzas Sakalas, Francesco Enrico Speroni, Rainer Wieland, Jaroslav Zvěřina, Tadeusz Zwiefka
Suplente(s) presente(s) en la votación final	Sharon Bowles, Mogens Camre, Brian Crowley, Jean-Paul Gauzès, Kurt Lechner, Georgios Papastamkos

ANEXO

**Directorate-General Internal Policies
Policy Department C
Citizens Rights and Constitutional Affairs**

DILEMMAS IN THE IMPLEMENTATION OF DIRECTIVE 2004/38 ON THE RIGHT OF CITIZENS AND THEIR FAMILY MEMBERS TO MOVE AND RESIDE FREELY IN THE EU

BRIEFING PAPER

Summary:

This Briefing Paper examines the main dilemmas that prevent EU citizens and their family members from fully enjoying their freedom of movement-related rights on the basis of Directive 2004/38 on the right of citizens of the Union and their family members to move and reside freely within the territory of the Member States. It assesses the most relevant deficits in the transposition of the Directive in light of the answers and data provided by the National Parliaments of 11 EU Member States (Austria, Belgium, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Italy, Lithuania, Poland, Romania, Slovak Republic, Slovenia and Spain) to the questionnaire prepared by the Committee on Civil Liberties and Justice and Home Affairs (LIBE) of the European Parliament.

This study was requested by: The European Parliament's Committee on Civil Liberties, Justice and Home Affairs.

This paper is published in the following languages: EN, FR.

Authors: **Sergio Carrera (Head of Section and Research Fellow) and Anaïs Faure Atger (Researcher), Centre for European Policy Studies, Justice and Home Affairs Section**

Manuscript completed **February 2009**

Copies can be obtained through:

Tel:

Fax:

E-mail:

Information on DG Ipol publications: <http://www.ipolnet.ep.parl.union.eu/ipolnet/cms>

Brussels, European Parliament

The opinions expressed in this document are the sole responsibility of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official position of the European Parliament.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Pages
1. Assessing National Transposition of Directive 2004/38: Scope and Methodology	1
2. Thematic Areas / Problematic Topics	3
2.1. Third-Country National Family Members of EU Citizens and Registered Partnerships	3
2.1.1. Third-Country National Family Members	3
2.1.2. Same-Sex Marriages and Registered Partnership: An Uneven Recognition	5
2.1.3. Family Members who are Dependents.....	6
2.2. Right of Entry, Stay and Exit: Delays and Obstacles	6
2.2.1. Entry	6
2.2.2. The Obligation to Report or Register	7
2.2.3. Residence for more than Three Months	8
2.3. Restrictions to the Access to Social Benefits.....	9
2.4. Use and Abuse of Expulsion Powers.....	10
2.4.1. Expulsions	10
2.4.2. Linkage of Recourse to the Social Assistance System and Expulsion	11
2.4.3. Procedural Safeguards.....	12
3. Conclusions	13
4. References	14
Annex. Questionnaire on the transposition of Directive 2004/38/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council	16

1. ASSESSING NATIONAL TRANSPOSITION OF DIRECTIVE 2004/38: SCOPE AND METHODOLOGY

The Committee on Civil Liberties and Justice and Home Affairs (LIBE) of the European Parliament launched an assessment procedure¹ aiming at highlighting the main problems entailed in the transposition of Directive 2004/38 on the right of citizens of the Union and their family members to move and reside freely within the territory of the Member States (hereafter Directive 2004/38).² The EP transmitted a questionnaire to all the National Parliaments of the EU Member States (MS) requesting qualitative, quantitative and statistical information on transposing legislation, administrative procedures and practical implementation of Directive 2004/38. The latter should have been implemented by 30 April 2006. The responses provided to the questionnaire at the end of 2008 have been often partial and obscure, and at times completely absent – only the following eleven MS provided an answer: Austria, Belgium, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Italy, Lithuania, Poland, Romania, the Slovak Republic, Slovenia and Spain. The resulting data offers however some valuable information concerning relevant weaknesses in the transposition of the Directive.

The EP's overall exercise constitutes a positive, while challenging, endeavour at times of strengthening the bridges and cooperation with National Parliaments in the so-called 'Area of Freedom, Security and Justice' (AFSJ) with the prospect of the entry into force of the Treaty of Lisbon in areas of such relevance such as the freedom of movement and, more widely, European citizenship.³ Indeed, in addition to Article 18 EC Treaty, the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the EU recognizes in Article 45 that the freedom of movement and residence constitutes one of the dearest European citizens' fundamental rights.⁴ The relevance granted by European citizens to the achievement of the freedom to move, as well as to its seminal role and added value in the promotion of European identity, has been often evidenced in various Eurobarometer reports.⁵ This freedom, and its linkage with the citizenship of the Union, has been revisited, developed and proactively interpreted by both substantive and institutional mechanisms characterizing the EU legal system, i.e. respectively, the Directive 2004/38⁶ and the jurisprudence of Community Courts, most particularly that of the European Court of Justice (ECJ). The assessment of the national implementation of Directive 2004/38 by the EP contributes to the promotion and protection of fundamental rights in the EU, the reinforcement of European citizenship as well as the democratic accountability of MS actions in the scope of EC free movement law.

In the Fifth Report on Citizenship of the Union [COM(2008) 85], the European Commission

¹ EP Resolution on application of Directive 2004/38/EC on the right of EU citizens and their family members to move and reside freely within the territory of the Member States, 15 November 2007, P6_TA(2007)0534, paragraph 8. See also EP Working Document, on Follow up to the EP resolution of 15 November on the application of Directive 2004/38 on the right of EU citizens and their family members to move and reside freely within the territory of the Member States, Rapporteur: Adina-Iona Vălean, 13 June 2008.

² Directive 2004/38/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 29 April 2004 on the right of citizens of the Union and their family members to move and reside freely within the territory of the Member States amending Regulation (EEC) No 1612/68 and repealing Directives 64/221/EEC, 68/360/EEC, 72/194/EEC, 73/148/EEC, 75/34/EEC, 75/35/EEC, 90/364/EEC, 90/365/EEC and 93/96/EEC.

³ On the stronger role of national parliaments under the institutional landscape provided by the Treaty of Lisbon in relation to an AFSJ see Carrera, S. and F. Geyer (2008).

⁴ Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union, OJ 2007/C 303/01, 14 December 2007.

⁵ See *inter alia* European Commission (2002), Candidate countries Eurobarometer: Public opinion in the countries applying for EU membership, The Gallup Organization, Hungary, DG Communication; European Commission (2006), The European Citizens and the Future of Europe – Qualitative Study in the 25 Member States, Eurobarometer, Optem, DG Communication; European Commission (2009), Awareness of Key Policies in the Area of Freedom, Security and Justice, Analytical Report, Flash Eurobarometer, The Gallup Organization, Hungary, DG Communication, page 36, point 4.2.

⁶ For an analysis refer to Carrera (2005).

confirmed that the control of the correct implementation of Directive 2004/38 remained a central priority.¹ On the basis of the call given by a EP Resolution of November 2007² and Article 39 (1) of the Directive, the Commission carried out an evaluation on its application which materialized in a Report published in December 2008 [COM (2008) 840]. The latter has been rather critical on MS and has qualified the overall transposition as ‘rather disappointing’.³ In particular, the Commission noted that there has been no MS which has ‘effectively and correctly’ transposed the entire Directive into their domestic legal regimes. It added that there is actually not a single provision of the measure which has been adequately implemented by all the MS! The information available in the Report has also substantiated, and has also somehow confirmed, some of the core findings emerging from the study of the information in the questionnaires presented in this Briefing Paper.

The incapacity shown by MS to fulfil their ‘obligation to act’ under Article 10 EC Treaty⁴ has negative implications on fundamental rights, the status of European Citizenship, the principle of equality and non-discrimination as well as the very foundations upon with the European Community is being rooted. The EU legal system relies on MS’ capacity to implement correctly and in a timely manner EC law. It also ‘takes for granted’ that MS comply with, and adhere closely to, the dynamic jurisprudence of the ECJ on these matters, and that the European Commission can secure compliance through its Treaty-based powers (e.g. Article 226 EC Treaty) and its current human and financial resources. Notwithstanding, the freedom of movement of EU citizens and family members constitutes an illustrative example where these presumptions simply do not work in the ground. The main victim of this failure is the liberty and security (fundamental rights) of the individual who remains vulnerable at times of ‘moving’ and encounters obstacles while trying to benefit from fundamental rights and freedoms attached to European citizenship. The legitimacy and credibility of the EU toward citizens’ expectations remains therefore very much at stake.

This Briefing Paper sets out where the key deficits are in respect of realizing the principle of free movement of Union citizens and their family members. Our focus centres on the identification of problematic areas where difficulties can be pointed out in the national implementation of Directive 2004/38. While our examination acknowledges results coming from other publicly available sources of information, such as those of the European Commission and previous EP questions and work, the foundations of this Paper are based on the data provided by National Parliaments in their responses to the questionnaires. From a methodological perspective we deem it also appropriate to stress that while the Briefing Paper underlines certain ‘bad practices’ and gaps between the framework of protection envisaged by Directive 2004/38 and its corresponding national legislation/administrative practices, our driving logic has not been ‘to name and shame’ those MS which have implemented ‘the least well’ the content and rights envisaged in the Directive. Rather, we aim at illustrating in a synthesized manner how some of the provisions of this piece of EU secondary law might have been misinterpreted and/or badly/inconsistently applied across the national arenas, and therefore at pointing out key thematic dimensions which remain critical and where the EP and National Parliaments should express their

¹ European Commission, Fifth Report on Citizenship of the Union, COM(2008) 85, Brussels, 15 February 2008.

² See footnote no. 1 above, paragraph 7, where the EP requested the Commission to deliver ‘a detailed assessment of the steps taken by Member States to implement Directive 2004/38 and of the correctness of its transposition...’.

³ Commission Report on the application of Directive 2004/38 on the right of citizens of the Union and their family members to move and reside freely within the territory of the Member States, COM(2008) 840 final, Brussels, 10 December 2008. See also Commission Communication, The impact of free movement of workers in the context of EU enlargement Report on the first phase (1 January 2007 – 31 December 2008) of the Transitional Arrangements set out in the 2005 Accession Treaty and as requested according to the Transitional Arrangement set out in the 2003 Accession Treaty, COM(2008) 765 final, Brussels, 18 November 2008.

⁴ Article 10 TEC states that “Member States shall take all appropriate measures, whether general or particular, to ensure fulfilment of the obligations arising out of this Treaty or resulting from action taken by the institutions of the Community. They shall facilitate the achievement of the Community’s task. They shall abstain from any measure which could jeopardize the attainment of the objective of this Treaty”.

greater concerns.

Furthermore, the questionnaire which was forwarded to the National Parliaments was structured by the LIBE Committee into nine headings intending to cover all stages relevant to the free movement of persons as stipulated by the Directive (refer to questionnaire provided in Annex 1 of this Paper). The shape of the questions was also based on those issues that had been already identified as problematic by the EP.¹ As stated above, however, the information that has been provided by national authorities has been partial, incomplete and selective. As the MEP Adina-Ioana Vălean, Rapporteur on the Initiative Report on the Application of Directive 2004/38,² underlined at the Joint Committee Meeting on ‘Progress in the Area of Freedom, Security and Justice’ of 19-20 January 2009,³ National Parliaments have not demonstrated much enthusiasm in complying with the EP’s request and answers have been scarce. This becomes obvious when taking into account that only eleven EU MS replied and sent back the questionnaire. Furthermore, the amount of information requested in each section of the questionnaire (approximately six sub questions per heading) seems to have encouraged the National Parliaments ‘to pick and choose’ those questions they were more willing to address, as well as the scope of the answers given. This has resulted in some MS providing detailed accounts of their implementing legislations that contrasted with other very succinct or non-existent answers. Indeed, while some National Parliaments have provided lengthy explanatory accounts on the content of their legislation, others have merely referred to the corresponding legal provisions without duly addressing the actual ways in which they are being interpreted and practiced. The diverse puzzle of data resulting from the materials has not facilitated the cross-comparison of the various transposition measures and the identification of common weaknesses.

Next Section aims at overcoming some of these open methodological issues by focusing on thematic areas where fundamental deficits might be identified at times of conducting a cross-comparative account of the results provided by the questionnaires. In short, the following four problematic topics can be underlined as showing major deficits and leading to conflict with the Directive: 1. Third-country nationals family members and registered partnerships; 2. Administrative requirements to the right to move and reside; 3. Restrictions to the access to social benefits; and 4. Use and abuse of expulsion powers.

2. THEMATIC AREAS / PROBLEMATIC TOPICS

2.1. THIRD-COUNTRY NATIONAL FAMILY MEMBERS OF EU CITIZENS AND REGISTERED PARTNERSHIPS

2.1.1. Third-Country National Family Members

As long as citizens of the Union exercise their free movement rights accompanied by family members who are also citizens of the Union they do not generally encounter many difficulties in light of

¹ EP Working Document, on Follow up to the EP resolution of 15 November on the application of Directive 2004/38 on the right of EU citizens and their family members to move and reside freely within the territory of the Member States, Rapporteur: Adina-Iona Vălean, 13 June 2008, page 6, where seven issues were already identified as problematic (i.e. notion of family member, authorisation of entry and issuing of residence cards for third country family members, documents demanded by border authorities and air carriers, the interpretation of sufficient resources and of the notion of ‘unreasonable burden to the social assistance system, the interpretation of ‘serious/imperative grounds of public policy and public security, abuse of rights and marriages of convenience).

² INI 2008/2184.

³ Joint Committee Meeting on the initiative of the European Parliament and the Czech Republic, Progress in the Area of Freedom, Security and Justice, 19-20 January 2009, European Parliament, Brussels. See <http://www.europarl.europa.eu/activities/committees/hearingsCom.do?language=EN&body=LIBE>

Directive 2004/38.¹ However, when they seek to be joined or accompanied by third-country national (TCN) family members many MS place obstacles which go against the spirit and wording of the Directive, as well as the case law of the Court of Luxembourg. As a way of illustration, the following problems can be highlighted across the MS subject to study in this paper in what concerns the treatment given to TCN family members at times of entry/admission. In **Italy** the entry requirement for all non-EU national family members to be in possession of an identification document is conditional upon holding a passport.² This is not consistent with Article 5(2) of the Directive which allows for the entry into a MS if in possession of other documentation such as a residence card issued by another MS. According to the questionnaire from the **Czech Republic** “a family member of an EU citizen who is not himself a citizen of the European Union is also obliged, during border control, to present the police with a visa authorizing him to present in the territory of the country if he is subject to a visa duty”.³ Furthermore in light of the provisions of the Directive, entry visa for TCN family members should be obtained free of charge, as soon as possible and on the basis of an accelerated procedure. This, however, does not seem to have been interpreted by all MS as a binding rule as few of them make mention of the existence of such procedures in their answers to the questionnaires. For example in **Slovenia**,⁴ although it is a requirement for family members that are not EU nationals to hold a valid passport with a visa, no special procedure to obtain this document in a easier way (‘as soon as possible and on the basis of an accelerated procedure’) appears to have been put into place. Moreover, the visa requirement should, according to the Directive, be waived when a TCN family member is in possession of a passport as well as a residence permit issued by another MS.

The ECJ has showed important interventions and proactive interpretations of the foundations of European citizenship which have expanded the enactment of this status both *ratione materiae* and *ratione personae*. The judicialization of the status of European citizen, and the freedoms and rights attached to it, has gradually enlarged and liberalised the limits of European citizenship.⁵ It remains unclear the extent to which all the EU-25 MS have yet applied fully the ECJ jurisprudence according to which TCN family members cannot be required to have been previously legally residing with an EU citizen in another MS in order to benefit from freedom of movement and the right of residence.⁶ Other MS are applying the ruling only to spouses and children of EU citizens exercising their free movement rights and not to wider family members, such as parents and grandparents who are also covered by the Directive. There seems to be also a tendency in some administrations to apply a sufficient resources requirement for TCNs’ family members even where the principal is a worker or self employed even

¹ Article 5 (2) (3) (4) and article 6 (2) of Directive 2004/38.

² Article 4 and 5 of the Legislative Decree No 30/2007, 6.02.2007 consolidated by Legislative Decree No 32/2008, 28 February 2008. They provide for free movement of all “Union Citizens with a ‘document valid for foreign travel in accordance with the legislation of the Member State’ and their family members who are not Community nationals but who hold a valid passport.”

³ It is however very interesting to note that in the second questionnaire provided this time by the Senate of the Parliament of the Czech Republic it is however said that “A family member of a European Union citizen, who is not a national of a EU Member State, is obliged to prove his/her identity by means of submitting a travel document or card of residence of a family member of a EU citizen or card of permanent residence permit; if the alien does not hold any of the aforementioned documents, s/he can prove his/her identity by means of submitting another type of document, however, s/he must concurrently prove that s/he is a family member of a European Union citizen”.

⁴ In Slovenia, the provisions of the Directive 38/2004 have been, for the most part, incorporated into the Aliens Act, setting out the conditions for the entry into and residence of aliens in the Republic of Slovenia.

⁵ The literature has focused on the dynamic role of Community Courts in the enactment of European citizenship and the significance of their successive rulings. See among others, Craig and De Búrca (2007), Kostakopoulou, (2007), Jacobs (2007) and Guild (2007b). For a ‘state of the art’ see Carrera and Merlini (2008).

⁶ According to the European Commission’s Report COM(2008) 840, on the basis of the Akrich judgement, Case C-109/01, Denmark, Ireland, Finland and the UK had made the right of residence conditional on their prior lawful residence in another MS. The report also highlights how other seven Member States had adopted a similar position through administrative practices. See page 4 of the Report.

though this is not permitted under Article 7 of Directive 2004/38.¹ Indeed, the relevance of ECJ rulings is exemplified by *Metock*,² where the Court overruled its previous arguments in *Akrich*³ and held that there is a right for citizens of the Union who are exercising their free movement rights in a host state to be joined or accompanied by TCN family members irrespective of where they are coming from (i.e. outside the EU or not) and prior lawful residence. From the questionnaires no information on the potential impact of these important judgments has been obtained.

2.1.2. Same-Sex Marriages and Registered Partnership: An Uneven Recognition

For those EU nationals who are entitled, under the national law of their home MS, to marry someone of the same sex, there is no clarity on the recognition of their marriages across the EU for the purpose of exercising free movement rights.⁴ Not only is this disparity in the recognition of different types of union misleading, but it also gives rise to frustration and exclusion of some citizens of the Union. For instance, in the **Czech Republic** while same-sex marriages are not permitted under national legislation, those concluded in another MS are recognized and the spouse is treated as family member of an EU citizen.⁵ **Austria, Cyprus, Poland** and **Slovakia**, on the other hand, do not recognize same-sex marriages or partnerships whether they take place on their territory or abroad.⁶ Registered partners also encounter problems when seeking to enforce their free movement rights. According to Articles 2 and 3 of the Directive, the duty on MS is to permit the residence of registered partners in the same way which they do for their own nationals (which presupposes that registered partnerships are recognized in the state). In some states this obligation has been interpreted more favourably. This has been the case in **Spain** which recognizes same sex registered partnerships and where the rules for entry and residence of registered partners are the same as for spouses.⁷ In **Slovenia** however the Aliens Act does not recognize these when concluded abroad even though their conclusion within the country is permitted under the Registration of a Same-Sex Civil Partnership Act. In **Romania** same gender partnerships are not recognized, but ‘taken into consideration’ if they were “registered before proper authorities and under legal provisions of the Member State of origin or provenience ... and only for the purpose of their exercise of right of free movement on Romanian territory”.⁸

In addition, as regards the children of same sex partnership, the Directive 2003/86 on the right of

¹ Article 7(1) of the Directive provides that “All Union citizens shall have the right of residence on the territory of another Member State for a period of longer than three months if they: (a)are workers or self-employed persons in the host Member State; **or** (b)have sufficient resources for themselves and their family members (...) and 7(2) “The right of residence provided for in paragraph 1 shall extend to family members who are not nationals of a Member State, accompanying or joining the Union citizen in the host Member State, provided that such Union citizen satisfies the conditions referred to in paragraph 1(a), (b) or (c); Refer to Section 2.3. of this Briefing Paper for its implementation.

² C-127/08 *Metock* 25 July 2008. See also C-1/05 *Jia*; C-459/99 *MRAX*; C-60/00 *Carpenter*, C-291/05, *Eind*, 11 December 2007, para. 45.

³ Paragraph 58 of *Metock*.

⁴ Article 2 (2) and 3 of Directive 2004/38. On this point see Carlier, J.Y. and E. Guild (2006).

⁵ Act No. 326/1999 Coll. On the Residence of Aliens in the Territory of the Czech Republic.

⁶ As reported by both national Parliaments in their answers to the questionnaire. Slovenia does not recognize same sex marital unions either.

⁷ Royal Decree No 240/2007, 16.02.2007 on the entry, free movement and residence in Spain of citizens of the Member States of the European Union and other states party to the Agreement of the European Economic Area which, according to the questionnaire recognizes that “partners, whatever their sex, are subject to the same rules as spouses if they are registered in a public register established for this purpose in a Member State of the EU or EEA. There is also no discrimination with regard to children”.

⁸ GEO no. 102/2005 on the free movement of citizens of the Member States of the European Union and the EEA on the Romanian territory.

family reunification¹ and the right to non-discrimination require that children be granted entry and residence rights regardless of their parents' legal status and sexual orientation. In respect to those MS which do not recognize same sex marriages or/and partnerships, this situation may consequently interfere with the right of the child to be with both his/her parents.

2.1.3. Family Members who are Dependents

There is also wide variety across the MS in relation to the interpretation of the concept of dependant person.² The European Commission's Report COM(2008) 840 stipulated that almost half of the MS had not transposed Article 3 (2) in a satisfactory way. As evidenced in the already restrictive interpretation of the category of other beneficiaries of the Directive, this statement of failure is based upon a practice of interpreting more restrictively MS' obligations towards family members of EU citizens.³ The information provided by the questionnaires in this regard has been unsatisfactory. The definition of this category has been given a very broad scope in **Belgium**.⁴ In **Cyprus** this definition is narrower.⁵ It also appears that the documents requested to substantiate this dependency status are very different from one MS to the other. These documents mainly purport to prove family ties and relationship, physical dependence and financial circumstances. The case of **Belgium** provides us again with a good example where the administrative requirements at national level are subject to a large margin of appreciation. In fact, in this country, 'there is no exhaustive list of documents'⁶ accepted by the authorities to prove the existence of dependency. As exemplified in the answers to the questionnaires by other MS, the national authorities retain a significant margin of manoeuvre to define who qualifies for this category and how this is can be evidenced. In **Italy**, while other family members do not seem to be covered by Legislative Decree 30/2007 transposing the Directive, 'durable partners' may be allowed to enter with an entry visa if "the relationship is duly attested by the Union citizen's state"⁷!

2.2. RIGHT OF ENTRY, STAY AND EXIT: DELAYS AND OBSTACLES

2.2.1. Entry

In order to enter the territory of a MS, Union Citizens and their family members need to be able to prove their identity.⁸ Although this usually means holding a valid identity card or passport, a resident

¹ Council Directive 2003/86/EC on the right to family reunification, 22.09.2003, OJL 251.

² Article 2 (2) and 3 (2) of Directive 2004/38.

³ The Report also states that ten MS had transposed it in a more favourable way. See page 4 of the Report.

⁴ Art. 40 bis, § 2, Loi 15.12.1980 sur l'accès au territoire, le séjour, l'établissement et l'éloignement des étrangers (LAT). See also for example Article 2 (1) of the Ordinance NO. 102/2005 implemented by Government Decision NO. 1864 of 21 December 2006 which broadly states that "any family member, irrespective of their nationality, not falling under the definition provided at point (3) and that is dependent of the citizen of the EU in the country of origin or country from which they are arriving", instead of direct descendant.

⁵ For instance, the questionnaire from Cyprus only states that "a dependent direct relative of the Union citizen in his ascending line and those of his/her spouse".

⁶ Reference BRI/108.2008 - LT/749087EN.doc. The Belgian questionnaire states that "The determination of whether anyone is or is not dependent is first of all an issue of facts, which makes it difficult to draw up general provisions. Nevertheless we can provide a broad outline of our administrative practice".

⁷ Article 3 of Legislative Decree 30/2007.

⁸ Article 5 of Directive 2004/38.

permit issued by another MS seems only to be considered acceptable by **Belgium**, **Lithuania** and **Spain**, even though this is an obligation under the Directive! Once on the territory, most MS now ask for individuals, in particular non-nationals, to be holding a valid Identity Card or Passport. Moreover, what seem to be more problematic are the procedures which apply once the EU citizen and/or family member do not hold the necessary identification documents. For instance, the obligation to give family members who do not satisfy the requirements for entry in a MS every reasonable opportunity to demonstrate that they are covered by the right of free movement and residence has been interpreted as equivalent to granting time to obtain the missing documents. However, as shown by the case of **Lithuania**, although phone and fax services are provided, no indication is given as to the length of a “reasonable period” given “before starting the return procedure”.¹ The actual application of this requirement is thus entrusted to the complete discretion of the border guard. In **Slovenia**, in such situations, an exceptional authorization to stay six hours in the border crossing area is granted!² In **Italy** a Union citizen or a family member who do not hold travel documents (or for TCNs family members an entry visa) will be refused entry unless they can provide the necessary documents (or provide proof of entitlement to freedom to move by means of ‘other appropriate documents’) within 24 hours. Not only Italy, but also other MS like **Poland**³ and **the Czech Republic**⁴ seem to accept other types of documents; however it is not clear which other documents this refers to and whether this is applicable to Union citizens and/or TCN family members.

2.2.2. The Obligation to Report or Register

Directive 2004/38 provides for administrative formalities for citizens of the Union who move from one MS to another to be very light and to only apply after the first three months of residence.⁵ In the **Slovak Republic**⁶ and the **Czech Republic** there is no registration system,⁷ but EU citizens are still under an obligation to report their presence to police authorities. According to the Czech legislation, failure to comply with this requirement results in an administrative offence and a fine.⁸ Similarly, in the Slovak Republic, if reporting is not done within 10 days, a fine of up to 1,659 Euros may be

¹ Order of the Ministers of interior and external affairs No 1V-280/V-109, 2.09.2004 “On the Rules of providing documents for visa, issuing visa, also issuing visa in the border control posts, extending the time of stay in the Republic of Lithuania, withdrawing visa, accrediting travel agencies” (Zin., 2004, Nr 136-4961).

² Slovenian Parliament’s answer: this however “is an exception to the general provisions, contained in the National Border Control Act”.

³ Polish Parliament answer: for a period no longer than 72 hours, the commandant of the Border Guards post gives “an opportunity to take steps to obtain a valid travel document or another valid document stating his/her identity and citizenship, or to prove in another unquestionable way that these persons have the right of free movement.”

⁴ In the questionnaire filled in by the Senate of the Czech Republic it is stated that “according to Article 6 paragraph 10 of the Residence of Aliens Act, if, at the time of border control, a European Union citizen does not have a travel document or cannot obtain one, the Police will allow him/her to prove his/her identity and the fact that s/he is a citizen of a EU Member State by means of another type of document (e.g. driving licence). If, at the time of border control, the family member of a EU citizen does not have a travel document or cannot obtain one, the Police will allow him/her to prove his/her identity and the fact that s/he is a family member of a EU citizen by means of another type of document”.

⁵ Articles 5 (5), 6 (1) and 8 of Directive 2004/38.

⁶ Section 49 §2 of the Act no. 48/2002 Coll. On the residence of foreigners.

⁷ Czech Parliament’s answer: “Under certain preconditions, all foreigners, i.e. also EU citizens and their family members, and also persons with permanent residence must report their presence in the territory of the country”. Refer to Article 93 (2) of the Residence Aliens Act which states that EU citizens and family members are under the obligation to report the place of their residence in the territory to the police within 30 days of the date of entry.

⁸ Article 157 (1) (r) of the Residence of Aliens Act. The fine will be of 3,000 Czech crowns.

applied.¹ These types of financial sanctions need to be tested against the principle of proportionality and that of non-discrimination as required by Article 5 (5) of Directive 2004/38, since it may be rather difficult for anybody to be aware of such administrative procedures upon arrival in a foreign country.

Under Article 8 (3) of the Directive, MS can require citizens to obtain a registration certificate after three months, in the event this is not done, they can even impose proportionate and non-discriminatory sanctions. In **Italy**, although there is no obligation for Union citizens to register in the three first months, in the absence of evidence of the duration of the stay, an EU citizen without statement of presence will be considered to have been in the country for longer and will therefore be subject to a fine.² In practice, this actually amounts to compulsory reporting within the first three months of stay.

Registration certificate should be also delivered ‘immediately’. However it appears that many MS have disregarded this aspect as well. **Belgium** has ignored this provision in its national implementing legislation and it has not included it as a positive obligation.³ This is even more worrying when one considers that in this country EU citizens may be detained in Belgium if they do not comply with administrative formalities.⁴ However, in one of the answers provided in the Belgium questionnaire, it is assured that the certificate is delivered immediately “when little examination is required to investigate whether the conditions for a registration certificate are satisfied”,⁵ while according to the information provided in another of the questionnaires provided by the Belgium National Parliaments (a total of three different questionnaires were provided by Belgium), the procedure to complete the registration appears to be long and tedious in practice.⁶

2.2.3. Residence for more than Three Months

One of the main issues giving rise to delay in the issue of certificates relates to evidence of ‘sufficient resources’ as included in article 7 (1) (b) of Directive 2004/38. MS are prevented from applying this requirement to workers or the self-employed but they can require other categories of citizens of the Union exercising their free movement rights to show that they have sufficient resources where they reside for longer than three months. In practice, it seems that the administrations in many MS make mistakes as regards each of these categories, and ask often workers (particularly those working part-time or carrying out casual jobs) to show evidence of sufficient resources. Where citizens of the Union have TCN family members who must obtain residence cards, the delay in issuing them can be substantial. This is notwithstanding a general requirement to issue documents as quickly as possible and in any event within six months of the application.⁷ While few MS refer in their transposing legislations to a maximum time limit for their issuing, it is difficult to assess whether this requirement is actually respected. In **Cyprus** for instance, although there is a legal obligation to respect this six months period, it has been reported that it in fact takes much longer.

In transposing Article 10 of Directive, MS have indeed largely reinterpreted the documents required,

¹ Section 46 §1 (e) of the Act no. 48/2002 Coll. On the residence of foreigners.

² According to article 5(5)(a) of Legislative Decree 30/2007 and the answer given by the Italian Parliament: “Although this is an optional procedure, failure by a Community citizen to report presence may be to his or her disadvantage: a Community citizen who does not hold a statement of presence is regarded, in the absence of evidence to the contrary, as having been resident in Italy for over three months.”

³ Art. 42, §4 LAT does not refer to this obligation.

⁴ See the Report on a visit to closed detention centres for asylum seekers and immigrants in Belgium by a delegation from the Committee on Civil Liberties, Justice and Home Affairs (LIBE), (PV723427, PE 404.465, 28.05.2008)

⁵ Questionnaire BRI/108.2008, page 15.

⁶ LT\749082EN.doc “The aliens Office will take a decision within five months of the application.”

⁷ Article 10 (1) of Directive 2004/38.

narrowing documentary evidence to the presentation of very specific documentation, such as an officially translated marriage certificate to prove family relationship, and adding new criteria like the possession of a health insurance or the proof of sufficient means. In the **Czech Republic**, a residence permit is issued to TCNs upon showing the residence card of his/her EU family member. Consequently, EU citizens with a TCN family member do need to register.¹ In **Lithuania**, the registration procedure takes place in two steps (first the obtaining of the residence permit from the local migration unit and then its ‘personalization’), and although this should according to the law be dealt with within two months, the administrative burden appears to be far heavier for this category of persons.²

It also appears that some MS have not at all transposed the Article on the conditions for residence of TCN family members of EU citizens as some have not referred to a specific implementing legislation.³ This further substantiates an additional concern expressed in the European Commission’s Report 2008 (840) whereby most MS do not comply with the obligation to issue specific residence cards for family members of Union citizens that would more favourably categorized them as such.⁴ At times of receiving the treatment they deserve in their capacity of family members of a Union citizen, such an omission will most probably prove to be a handicap.

2.3. RESTRICTIONS TO THE ACCESS TO SOCIAL BENEFITS

One of the most common sources of friction between citizens of the Union and host MS is around access to social benefits. Not only do MS tend to apply a sufficient resources test to all citizens of the Union whether or not they are workers or self-employed, but they also tend to refuse registration certificates or family reunification on the basis of ‘insufficient resources’. Workers are entitled to all social benefits on the basis of equal treatment with own nationals. The Directive 2004/38 does however provide for different treatment whether the free mover is economically active or not.⁵ Taking into account the answers provided in the questionnaire, the practice for applying the sufficient resources test seems to be highly inconsistent. An example of this is **Belgium**, where although the test is not systematically applied, it includes many different variables and the distinction between economically and non-economically active is not made.⁶ **Poland** applies similar rules.⁷ Other MS, such as **Lithuania**, have not transposed this obligation and check on a case-by-case basis whether EU citizens and their family members possess at least the minimum level of national income supported by the state; however it is not clear whether this is assessed in the light of the expected length of stay and whether the presence of dependants is taken into account.⁸

¹ These circumstances then fall under the category of the “certain preconditions” referred in footnote 43 above.

² In application of Article 99 of the Law on the legal status of aliens as reported in the Lithuanian’s Parliament questionnaire.

³ On the basis of the information provided in the questionnaires this appears to be the case in Slovenia and Romania.

⁴ Page 6 of the Report which expressly states that “A serious problem is that in a number of Member States the residence card is not called “Residence card of a family member of a Union citizen”, as required by Article 10. Family members concerned may find it difficult to prove that their situation falls under the Directive, and not under the more restrictive national rules on aliens”.

⁵ Article 7 and 8 of Directive 2004/38.

⁶ Article 40 (4) of the Law of 15 December 1980. The questionnaire states that “Only persons likely to be in a precarious situation are assessed (doubtful case, application to the C.P.A.S. – public social assistance centre)”. The competent authority is either the Commune or the Aliens Office.

⁷ §2, Dziennik Ustaw, No. 217, item 1616, read together with article 15§3 of the Aliens Act. The border guards are responsible for enforcing these provisions, and their decisions apply immediately.

⁸ According to the questionnaire “There is no definition of ‘sufficient resources’ in the laws. The situation of every particular is assessed individually...In case of the family member, both the resources of the family member and the partner may be taken

Furthermore, EU citizens who lose their employment retain their status as worker for the purpose of residence rights and of access to social benefits under the Directive.¹ However, many MS fail to give effect to this right to benefits when unemployed instead treating citizens of the Union who are in this situation as if they were new arrivals.² In fact while this was not a specific question included in the questionnaires, this obligation should be kept in mind in particular when considering the implementation of Article 14 of the Directive which refers to the unreasonable burden to social assistance threshold (See Section 2.4.2 below).

2.4. USE AND ABUSE OF EXPULSION POWERS

2.4.1. Expulsions

According to Article 28 of the Directive, automatic expulsion of Union citizens is prohibited and MS are only permitted to exclude or expel citizens of the Union on the grounds of “public policy, public security or public health”.³ Furthermore, expulsion decisions must be based exclusively on the personal conduct of the individual concerned.⁴ On the basis of the questionnaires, a number of *lacunas* can be identified. Some MS do not provide for a conceptual framing of what the normative categories of public policy, public security and public health really mean. This is the case for instance in the **Czech Republic**⁵ and **Slovak Republic**.⁶ Such omissions leave wide room for discretion to the police and allows for diverse administrative practices. In **Italy**, for example, restrictions are allowed on grounds of ‘State security, imperative reasons of public security and other grounds of public policy or public security’.⁷ However, Italian law only offers a definition of ‘imperative reasons of public security’. The ways in which national authorities take into account and examine the protection against expulsion provided in Article 28 (1) of Directive 2004/38, and more particularly “the social and cultural integration into the host Member State and the extent of his/her links with the country of origin”, is also far from clear.

As already highlighted by the European Commission Report COM(2008) 840,⁸ there are still two MS, **Italy** and **Finland**, which provide in their national law for automatic expulsions of citizens of the Union serious criminal convictions or ‘having committed a crime of certain gravity’ at times of deciding whether the person constitutes a threat to public policy and public security. The Italian Penal Code states that the expulsion of a Community national will occur in the case of a sentence of imprisonment of at least two years or in the case of a crime against the personality of the state

into account. In order to prove the sources of their income, applicants must provide respective documents. No other measures of control are applied”.

¹ Article 7 (3) and 24 of Directive 2004/38; See also Case C-456/02, *Trojani* [2004] ECR I-7573 and Case C-184/99, *Grzelczyk* [2001] ECR I-6193.

² Refer to Minderhoud (2009).

³ Refer to *inter alia* Case C-413/99, *Baumbast* [2002] ECR I-07091 and Case 67/74, *Carmelo Angelo Bonsignore v. Oberstadtdirektor der Stadt Köln* [1975] ECR 00297. See also Joined Cases C-259/91, C-331/91 and C-332/91 *Alluè and Others* [1993] ECR I-4309, para. 15, and Case C-30/77, *Régina v. Pierre Bouchereau* [1977] ECR 01999, para. 35.

⁴ Article 27 (2) of Directive 2004/38.

⁵ The questionnaire from Czech Republic states that “In general, it should be stated that State security and public policy are ‘indefinite’ legal terms that must be construed according to the specific situation”. Refer to the Act on Residence of Foreigners in the Territory of the Czech Republic, Article 9.1 and 2.

⁶ According to the questionnaire “As to restrictions on the free movement the police may deny entry to a citizen of the EEC and his/her family member if there is a reasonable suspicion that he/she threatens security of the state, public order or for the reason of protection of public health”. See Act. No. 48/2002 Coll., Sec. 6, paragraph 1.

⁷ See Decree 30/2007 of 6 February 2007 as amended and consolidated by Decree No. 32 of 28 February 2008, Article 20.

⁸ Page 8.

(irrespective of the duration of the sentence).¹ Furthermore, the legal concept of “imperative reasons of public security” includes ‘any previous convictions for serious offences handed down by an Italian or foreign Court’. Finally, in the context of its ‘security package’, new grounds for expulsion will be introduced.² It follows that EU citizens and their family members may be removed from the Italian territory if they do not register with the competent authorities within 10 days after the established three month period. In the **Czech Republic**, it appears that the most frequent criminal law punishment imposed on foreigners is expulsion if this is required for the safety of persons or property or other public interest.³ In this context, the issue of compliance with the proportionality requirement of the Directive may be raised. A similar concern applies to **Romania** where restrictions to free movement and expulsions can take place if there is an ‘imminent danger’ for the public policy and public security. The meaning and scope of this category is not developed in the law.⁴

Some MS do not accept that the limitations on expulsion apply even where the citizen of the Union has resided for more than three months and does not yet fulfil the conditions of work, self employment or residence. Further, in some MS, in particular **Italy** and **France**, the expulsion of citizens of the Union after three months residence where they cannot show that they have sufficient resources seems disproportionately exercised against nationals of one particular MS: i.e. Romania.⁵ Very little quantitative, and hardly any qualitative data, was provided in this respect by the national answers provided by Italy in the questionnaire.⁶

2.4.2. Linkage of Recourse to the Social Assistance System and Expulsion

While Directive 2004/38 does not permit MS to automatically expel a citizen of the Union because s/he has become an ‘unreasonable’ burden on the social assistance system,⁷ a number of MS seem to

¹ See Articles 235 and 312 of the Penal Code as amended by Decree-Law No 92 of 23 May 2008 (converted finally into Law No 125 of 24 July 2008).

² In particular the Legislative Decree Scheme establishes that EU Citizens wishing to reside in Italy for more than three months have the obligation - for reasons of public order and public security - to register with the competent authorities within 10 days after the expiration of the three month period residence. According to Article 20 Legislative Decree N°30/2007 - as modified by the scheme of Legislative Decree scheme - the failure to comply with this rule represents “an imperative reason of security” allowing limitations to the right to entrance and residence of EU Citizens and their family members. Schema di decreto legislativo recante ulteriori modifiche e integrazioni al decreto legislativo 6 febbraio 2007, n. 30, di attuazione della direttiva 2004/38/CE relativa al diritto dei cittadini dell’Unione e dei loro familiari di circolare e di soggiornare liberamente nel territorio degli Stati membri. Available at: http://www.camera.it/_dati/leg16/lavori/AttiDelGoverno/pdf/0005.pdf

³ Section 57 of the Czech Criminal Code as described in the Czech answer to the questionnaire.

⁴ Refer to Article 25 (2) of Law No. 260/2005, Official Gazette, No. 900, 7 October 2005.

⁵ European Parliament Resolution on the application of Directive 2004/38/EC on the right of EU citizens and their family members to move and reside freely within the territory of the Member States, 15.11.2007.

⁶ On the legal measures adopted by the Italian Government in the framework of the ‘Security package’ see European Parliament resolution of 10 July 2008 on the census of the Roma on the basis of ethnicity in Italy, available at: http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getDoc.do?pubRef=-//EP//TEXT+TA+P6-TA-2008-0361+0+DOC+XML+V0//EN&language=EN#ref_1_12; Council of Europe, Memorandum presented by Thomas Hammarberg Commissioner for Human Rights of the Council of Europe. Available at: [https://wcd.coe.int/ViewDoc.jsp?Ref=CommDH\(2008\)18](https://wcd.coe.int/ViewDoc.jsp?Ref=CommDH(2008)18); European Union Fundamental Rights Agency, Incident Report: Violent attacks against Roma in the Ponticelli district of Naples, Italy; Available at: http://fra.europa.eu/fra/material/pub/ROMA/Incid-Report-Italy-08_en.pdf.

⁷ Recital 16 and Article 14 (3) of Directive 2004/38. Recital 16 states that “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 the automatic consequence of recourse to the social assistance system. The host member state should examine whether it is a case of temporary difficulties and take into account the duration of residence, the personal circumstances and the amount of aid granted in order to consider whether the beneficiary has become an unreasonable burden on its social assistance system and to proceed to his expulsion. In no case should an

take this approach. Notwithstanding the need to take into account conditions of proportionality and individually assessed decisions of the personal situation, the criterion not to represent an ‘unreasonable burden’ has been implemented in very different ways at national level. While some MS do not specify how this is actually applied, such as for example **Austria** that merely states that it takes all relevant criteria into account,¹ others like the **Czech Republic** appear to have created detailed national scaling systems in the shape of a points-based system. This system comprises the duration of residence to date, the duration of employment and education and potentials for future employability, qualifications as well as the unemployment rate in the region of residence. In **Belgium**, the administrative authorities can declare the termination of residence of less than three years of a foreign national who has been dependent on social assistance (*centre public d'aide sociale – C.P.A.S*) for more than three months. In the **Slovak Republic** on the other hand, family members of EU citizens have to submit a declaration that they will not become burden to the health care and social assistance system.² In **Cyprus** the competent authority (The Social Welfare Services of the Ministry of Labour and Social Insurance) will take into consideration ‘the personal situation’ of the person and “this assessment shall not be carried out systematically”.³

2.4.3. Procedural Safeguards

An expulsion order may only be enforced after a month of notification except in duly substantiated cases of emergency.⁴ According to the Commission Report COM(2008) 840 few MS have transposed the safeguards correctly and inaccurate transposition constitutes the general rule.⁵ Indeed, from the information provided by the questionnaires it appears that this requirement was misinterpreted, and at times completely ignored, in a number of MS. As a way of illustration, in **Lithuania**, the decision obliging an EU national or his/her family member to leave the country must be implemented without delay, within one month of the taking of the decision.⁶ In **Romania**, while no timeframe is given for the enforcement of an expulsion decision, the right of residence terminates on the day of the ruling and appeals (which might be presented within 10 days as from the notification date) do not have a suspensive effect.⁷ The transposition of the Directive 2004/38 carried out by **Spain** has been partial. The national law does not include an express reference to the need for allowing an evaluation of the legality of the expulsion decision and on the facts and circumstances on which the expulsion measure

expulsion measure be adopted against workers, self-employed persons or job-seekers as defined by the Court of Justice save on grounds of public policy or public security”.

¹ The Austrian questionnaire states that “According to administrative data and case-law, a person would become an unreasonable burden on the social assistance system if the purpose of their entering the country was in order to draw social benefits; Where there is no early indication of abuse, an individual assessment is made, whereby all relevant circumstances – especially the duration and purpose of stay (entry for employment purposes or as a student, etc) – are taken into account”.

² Article 45b (3) (d) of the Act no. 48/2002 Coll. on the residence of foreigners.

³ Article 10 (5) of the Law on the Right of Union Citizens and their Family Members to Move and Reside Freely within the Territory of the Republic of Cyprus, 9 February 2007.

⁴ Articles 28, 30 and 31 of Directive 2004/38.

⁵ For instance the Report highlights that “in cases of absolute urgency, no procedural safeguards apply in France. The EU citizen receives no written notification of the expulsion decision, is not informed of the grounds on which the decision was taken and has no right of appeal before the decision is enforced”, see point 3.8.2, page 9 of the Report.

⁶ Article 127 of the Law on the Legal Status of Aliens, Žin., 2006, Nr. 137-5199.

⁷ The Questionnaire also states that “In strongly motivated cases and in order to prevent imminent damage, the plaintiff may ask the Court to take the decision of suspending the materialization of the decision of declaring undesirable person, up to the moment the action is solved. The court shall urgently solve the suspension request, the decision in this case being de iure executorial”.

has been based (Article 31 (3) of Directive 2004/38).¹ In the case of **Slovenia**, the situation appears to be even more worrying as according to the answers provided by the Slovenian National Parliament, no data on procedural safeguards in the country are at all available.

3. CONCLUSIONS

Union citizenship constitutes the fundamental status of nationals of the MS.² This status, as well as the rights attached to it (e.g. the freedom of movement), is dynamic and transformative in scope and potentials. It remains in constant change thanks to the substantive instruments and institutional structures of the EU legal system. EU secondary law has progressively affected and expanded its original substance provided by the Treaties. The increasing involvement of the Community Courts is also limiting MS's discretionary powers and exceptions to the European fundamental rights that Union citizenship confers.³ The Directive 2004/38 has substantially revisited the nature of and limits to the freedom to move. It has also reduced the administrative formalities for exercising free movement rights. It has brought a great simplification to previous regulatory framings, by merging into a single instrument all former sectoral legislation (two regulations and nine directives).⁴

Notwithstanding, citizens of the Union and their family members continue to face significant barriers at times in accessing and enjoying their full set of rights and freedoms across the national arenas in the EU. This Briefing Paper has examined some of the main deficits emerging from the responses provided by National Parliaments to the questionnaire elaborated by the LIBE Committee of the EP. While acknowledging the limitations and methodological deficiencies characterizing the EP's overall evaluation exercise – the partial and incomplete nature of the information coming out of the answers by the 11 National Parliaments to the questionnaires – the following four thematic areas of particular concern have been identified on the basis of the questionnaires: First, the treatment granted to third-country nationals' family members and registered partnerships; Second, the administrative requirements applying to the rights to enter and reside; Third, restrictions from having access to social benefits; and finally, the use of expulsion powers.

The European Commission Report COM(2008) 840 and the Draft Opinion of the Committee on Legal Affairs of the EP⁵ have both concluded that the national transposition of Directive 2004/38 in the legal systems in a majority of MS contradicts directly the supranational framework of protection provided by Directive 2004/38. This paper has confirmed these critical concerns by further illustrating some problematic implementing measures and domestic practices that are incompatible with the fundamental right of freedom of movement by EU citizens and their family members (including TCNs), and therefore contravene the very institution of European citizenship. The synthesized overview which has been provided gives grounds for challenging common assertions that 'take too easily for granted' the capacity of MS, and therefore that of the Union as a whole, to ensure proper and timely implementation of EU legislation and ECJ jurisprudence, and that of the European Commission

¹ See Article 17 (1) and (2) of the Royal Decree No. 240/2007 of 16 February 2007 on the entry, free movement and residence in Spain of citizens of the Member States of the EU and other States party to the Agreement on the European Economic Area. Furthermore the Spanish national implementing law refers only indirectly to the requirements stipulated in Article 30 (1) and 2 of the Directive. No express reference is being made in Spanish law to the need to notify in writing the person concerned of the expulsion decision, and that they need to be informed "precisely and in full, of the public policy, public security and public health grounds on which the decision taken in their case is based".

² Case C-184/99, *Grzelczyk* [2001] ECR I-6193, paragraph 31.

³ Carrera and Merlino (2008).

⁴ Refer to Apap (2002).

⁵ European Parliament, Draft Opinion of the Committee of Legal Affairs for the Committee on Civil Liberties, Justice and Home Affairs, on the application of Directive 2004/38/EC on the rights of citizens of the Union and their family members to move and reside freely within the territory of the Member States, 2008/2184(INI), Rapporteur: Monica Frassoni, 16 January 2009.

to ensure MS compliance through its current structures (human resources and budget) and enforcement mechanisms.

The protection of the freedom to move (as a seminal part of the status of European citizenship) as provided by EU law and as developed by Community Courts constitutes a central element of EU citizens' expectations towards the Union. It is in the national transposition phase where the greatest care and attention needs to be taken in order to ensure that MS discretion and 'exceptionalism' (i.e. exceptions to European fundamental rights) do not go beyond the level of protection provided by the common set of guarantees and freedoms envisaged in the EU legal regime. The incapacity of current structures and enforcement mechanisms to duly ensure a correct and timely transposition of EU law in such a fundamental aspect of European identity such as that of the freedom of movement is simply unacceptable for the sake of the legitimacy and reputation of the EU project as a whole. Further, the main victims of this failure are the liberty and security of the individual. If the EU wants to communicate with the citizen and for the citizen honestly to engage with EU law and policy, it must show the citizen that fundamental rights are duly protected against improper use – including unacceptable laws and practices by MS in the scope of EU law.¹ By delivering protection to the individual beyond the nation-state, the EU fosters European identity and confidence amongst its citizens and others.

The EP, in cooperation with National Parliaments, could (and should) play a more decisive role at times of exercising a democratic account/review of the national laws and practices covering the common set of European rights and fundamental freedoms, and that they are respected consistently and implemented coherently all across the Union. This would help overcome illiberal interference and unacceptable exceptions by MS in relation to the freedom of movement and the status of Union Citizenship. The innovative institutional setting provided by the still pending Treaty of Lisbon will guarantee an enhanced and active role to National Parliaments in the evaluation mechanisms for the implementation of AFSJ-related policies. Ideally this role should favour an increased involvement of National Parliaments at times of safeguarding European interests and fundamental rights in their respective domestic arenas in the scope of a common AFSJ. It is also for National Parliaments to assist citizens in gaining more consciousness of the rights guaranteed by this instrument and in enforcing them before relevant authorities. The cooperation and commitment by National Parliaments in assessment exercises such as the one launched by the LIBE Committee regarding Directive 2004/38 is indeed central for this goal to succeed in the future and for the EU to be able to deliver citizens' expectations.

4. REFERENCES

- Apap, J. (2002), *Freedom of movement of persons: A practitioner's handbook*, The Hague: Kluwer Law International.
- Carlier, J.Y. and E. Guild (eds.) (2006), *The Future of Free Movement of Persons in the EU*, Collection du Centre des Droits de L'Homme de l'Université Catholique de Louvain, Brussels: Bruylant.
- Carrera, S. (2005), "What does free movement mean in theory and practice in an enlarged EU?", *European Law Journal*, Vol. 11, No. 6, November, pp. 699-721.
- Carrera, S. and F. Geyer (2008), 'The reform treaty and justice and home affairs: implications for the common area of freedom, security and justice' in Guild, E. and Geyer, F. (eds.), *Security versus justice? Police and judicial cooperation in the European Union* (Hampshire: Ashgate), pp. 289-307.
- Carrera, S. and Merlino, M. (2008), *The European Court of Justice and Enacting Citizenship*, State of

¹ See Guild (2007a).

the Art Report, ENACT (Enacting European Citizenship), retrievable from http://www.enacting-citizenship.eu/index.php/sections/deliverables_item/141

Craig, P. and G. De Búrca (2007), *EU LAW, Text, Cases, and Materials*, fourth edition, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Guild, E. (2007a), *Making the EU Citizens' Agenda Work*, CEPS Policy Brief No. 122, Centre for European Policy Studies (CEPS): Brussels, February 2007.

Guild, E. (2007b), "Citizens without a Constitution, Borders without a State: EU free Movement of Persons", in A. Baldaccini, E. Guild and H. Toner (eds), *Whose Freedom Security and Justice? EU Immigration and Asylum Law and Policy*, Oxford: Hart Publishing, pp 25-55.

Jacobs, F.G. (2007), "Citizenship of the European Union – A Legal Analysis", *European Law Journal*, Special Issue on EU Citizenship, Vol. 13, Issue 5, pp. 591-622.

Kostakopoulou, T. (2007), "European Citizenship: Writing the Future", *European Law Journal*, Special Issue on EU Citizenship, Vol. 13, Issue 5, pp. 623-646.

Minderhoud, P. (2009), 'Access to Social Assistance Benefits and Directive 2004/38', in E. Guild, K. Groenendijk and S. Carrera (eds), *Illiberal Liberal States: Immigration, Citizenship and Integration in the EU*, Ashgate Publishing: Hampshire, forthcoming.

ANNEX

QUESTIONNAIRE ON THE TRANSPOSITION OF DIRECTIVE 2004/38/EC OF THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT AND OF THE COUNCIL

Has Directive 38/2004 been implemented in your Member State? Could you provide the LIBE Committee with the transposition measures?

Do you keep qualitative, quantitative and statistical data on the application of Directive 38/2004? Could you provide the LIBE Committee with such information?

Specific questions:

1. Definitions of spouse and registered partnership in relation to free movement

(Articles 2,3,7,8,10,12,13,17)

Does your Member State (MS), in its national law or in reference to the application of the Directive:

- recognize as “spouse” EU and third country same-sex partners of Union citizens?
- recognize as “partner” EU and third country different-sex registered partners or also same-sex partners?
- recognize as family member second/third/fourth spouses of EU citizens?
- facilitate entry and residence for “other” family members and partners , including of same sex and how? Does the term “partners” include cohabitants, also of same-sex?
- What about children of same-sex couples?

2. Right of Exit and Right of Entry

(Articles 4 and 5)

- Does your MS impose any restriction to the right of exit and in what cases?
- Are other documents recognized as equivalent to ID or passport or entry visa to enjoy free movement?
- According to your national law, are EU citizens and/or his/her family members, obliged to hold an ID/passport and is the same obligation imposed to nationals?
- Does your national legislation impose to airlines or other travel companies (Eurostar, Thalys or others) to check identity of passengers at borders and on what ground?
- Shall an EU citizen and/or his/her family members not satisfy the requirements for entry in your MS, what measures would be taken ? How do you apply the obligation “to give such persons every reasonable opportunity to demonstrate that they are covered by the right of free movement and residence”?

3. Reporting presence

(Article 5.5)

- Does your national legislation require EU citizens and/or their family members to report their presence in their territory ? Please provide details (to whom, how, when, where...) If so, does your MS provide for sanctions in the case EU citizen do not comply? If so, what kind of sanction?

4. Right of residence and conditions

(Article 6, 7 and 14)

- How does your MS count the 3 months period from the date of arrival ? If a person leaves the host MS before the end of 3 months period and comes back immediately after does the 3 months period start again?
- How does your MS apply the condition of „sufficient resources“ ? Does national legislation take into account the personal situation of the person concerned such as, for instance, having a free accommodation? Does national legislation take into account the resources of a family member or a partner ? Does your MS assess the condition of sufficient resources systematically? Or does it apply a random control system ? If so, on what basis ? What authority is competent for the assessment of the condition of sufficient resources ? In case local authorities are involved in or are in charge of this assessment, are they allowed to issue additional requirements at local level ? What kind of requirements ?
- How does your MS apply the condition for persons not to be an „(unreasonable) burden on the social assistance system of the host MS“ ? Please illustrate in detail: basis for the assessment, competent authority and procedure, outcomes / consequences / sanctions, verifications, application of the prohibition of systematic verifications and of automatic expulsion, related data available etc.
- How does your MS apply the condition for persons to have a „comprehensive sickness insurance“ ? Please illustrate in detail.

5. Registration of Union citizens and their family members, Residence card

(Articles 8,9,10 and 11)

- Does your MS require EU citizens and/or their family members to register after 3 months ? Please provide exact details: to what authority, documents and „proofs“ required for each category of persons, reasons for refusal, deadline for registering after arrival, what „proportionate and non-discriminatory“ sanctions are imposed in case of non compliance, any statistical or detailed data or information available in relation to registrations, any other document requested that is not listed in the directive (such as medical declarations, for instance on HIV), etc.

6. Restrictions to free movement and expulsions an grounds of public policy, public security and public health

(Articles 27 to 29, 31)

- Does your MS restrict free movement on grounds of „public policy“, „public security“ or „public health“ ? Please provide details on: definitions in national law and jurisprudence, authorities involved, possibility for expulsion orders or other measures to be issued on these grounds, if any sickness constitute a ground for expulsion (for instance HIV), methods of assessment, implementation of the requirement for personal conduct of the individual considered to be a „genuine, present and sufficiently serious threat affecting one of the fundamental interests of society“, of the prohibition for previous criminal convictions not to constitute grounds for restrictive measures, etc.
- How does your MS take into account what provided in art. 28.1 before taking an expulsion decision on grounds of public policy and public security ? How does your MS define *serious* and *imperative* grounds of public policy or public security to order expulsion for permanent residents, more than 10 years residents and minors ?
- How many expulsion orders have been issued so far ? Please provide quantitative and qualitative data available by ground for expulsion, nationality, age, etc.

7. Procedural safety and redress procedure

(Articles 15, 30 and 31)

- How does your MS ensure the application of the procedural safeguards provided in the Directive? Please illustrate in detail (notification in writing, translations, information provided, existence of a format, competent authorities to appeal against the decision, deadline to leave the country, redress procedure, possibility to request and to suspend the decision, proportionality requirement, exclusion orders, how this works in practice, etc.)

8. Other issues

- Does your MS national legislation allow for expulsion orders to be taken as a penalty or legal consequence of a custodial penalty (Article 33) ?
- How does national legislation implement „abuse of rights and fraud“ ? (Article 35)
- „effective and proportionate“ sanctions (Article 36): please illustrate in detail which sanctions (administrative, civil or criminal), maximum and minimum penalties, detention or other restrictive measures, exclusion and expulsion orders, any related data and information.

9. Other information

Please provide any other information or comment that you think might be useful.

RESULTADO DE LA VOTACIÓN FINAL EN COMISIÓN

Fecha de aprobación	16.3.2009
Resultado de la votación final	+: -: 0:
Miembros presentes en la votación final	Alexander Alvaro, Roberta Angelilli, Alfredo Antoniozzi, Mario Borghezio, Catherine Boursier, Emine Bozkurt, Philip Bradbourn, Kathalijne Maria Buitenweg, Maddalena Calia, Michael Cashman, Carlos Coelho, Esther De Lange, Panayiotis Demetriou, Gérard Deprez, Urszula Gacek, Kinga Gál, Jeanine Hennis-Plasschaert, Ewa Klamt, Magda Kósáné Kovács, Wolfgang Kreissl-Dörfler, Henrik Lax, Baroness Sarah Ludford, Claude Moraes, Rareş-Lucian Niculescu, Martine Roure, Sebastiano Sanzarello, Inger Segelström, Ioannis Varvitsiotis, Manfred Weber
Suplente(s) presente(s) en la votación final	Adamos Adamou, Alin Lucian Antochi, Edit Bauer, Simon Busuttil, Marco Cappato, Carlo Casini, Iratxe García Pérez, Sophia in 't Veld, Metin Kazak, Jean Lambert, Marian-Jean Marinescu, Nicolae Vlad Popa, Adina-Ioana Vălean
Suplente(s) (art. 178, apdo. 2) presente(s) en la votación final	Iles Braghetto, Jan Cremers, Raül Romeva i Rueda