

EU fair trial measures as part of the Stockholm Programme

Criminal law has become the most rapidly developing area of EU cooperation since the Lisbon Treaty, which abolished the highly ineffective third pillar, came into effect in December 2009.² As a result of complex institutional changes, mainly the introduction of the co-decision procedure, the ratification of the Treaty brought more significant changes to the area of criminal cooperation than to any other areas.³ Several policy and legislative changes were needed to properly address the new situation of the post-Lisbon Treaty era.

On a political level, the Council of the European Union drafted a Roadmap set out to strengthen the rights of suspects and accused persons throughout the EU in November 2009.⁴ In December, the European Council accepted the Stockholm Programme, which was the third multiannual programme on the European Union's Area of Freedom, Security and Justice (AFSJ) and incorporated the Roadmap as a part of the new programme. It was meant to highlight the priorities for EU institutions on AFSJ cooperation between 2009 and 2014.⁵ In April 2010 an Action Plan to implement the changes was released by the Commission in the form of a communication.⁶ Among many things, one of the scopes of the designated period was to create a "Europe of rights" by providing better protection of fundamental rights of suspected and accused people. In June 2014, the Stockholm Programme was joined by a set of strategic guidelines.⁷

Although the significance of EU criminal law in the post-Lisbon system has improved greatly, legislation in the area must be made very cautiously. All member states view criminal law as "the last bastion of their sovereignty" which results in a very slow-paced harmonization process. One of the solutions for this problem is to find similarities in national legislations and create minimum rules based on that.

The Stockholm Programme decided that EU should accept minimum rules in the area of the suspect's rights. As part of this process five Directives have been accepted regarding different measures. These are the Translation and Interpretation Directive (measure A),⁸ the

¹ Dr. habil Anita Nagy, associate professor at the University of Miskolc, Faculty of Law, Institute of Criminal Sciences, dr. László Dornfeld, 2nd year PhD student at the University of Miskolc, Faculty of Law

² Damian Chalmers – Gareth Davies – Giorgio Motti: *EU Criminal Law*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2014. p. 583.

³ Steve Peers: *EU Justice and Home Affairs Law*. In: *The Evolution of EU Law* (ed. Paul Craig – Gráinne de Búrca). New York: Oxford University Press, 2011. p. 269.

⁴ Roadmap for strengthening procedural rights of suspected or accused persons in criminal proceedings, RESOLUTION OF THE COUNCIL, of 30 November 2009, (2009/C 295/01)

⁵ Sergio Carrera – Elspeth Guild: *Does the Stockholm Programme matter? The Struggles over Ownership of AFSJ Multiannual Programming*. In: CEPS Papers in Liberty and Security in Europe. CEPS, 2012, ISBN 978-94-6138-253-5

<https://www.ceps.eu/system/files/No%2051%20Carrera%20and%20Guild%20on%20Stockholm%20Programme.pdf> [30.04.2017]

⁶ European Commission, Communication, Delivering an area of freedom, security and justice for Europe's citizens: Action Plan implementing the Stockholm Programme, COM(2010) 171 final, Brussels, 20 April 2010.

⁷ Conclusions – 26/27 June 2014, <http://eujusticia.net/images/uploads/pdf/future-justice-2014-06-27-council-strategic-guidelines.pdf> [30.04.2017.]

⁸ Directive 2010/64/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of 20 October 2010 on the right to interpretation and translation in criminal proceedings. OJ 2010 L 280, 26.10.2010.

Right to Information Directive (measure B),⁹ the Access to a Lawyer Directive (measure C1)¹⁰, the Presumption of Innocence Directive (measure C2)¹¹ and lastly the Directive on procedural safeguards for children who are suspects or accused persons in criminal proceedings.¹²

In this paper we would like to focus on two of these EU legal instruments: the Right to Information Directive and the Presumption of Influence Directive. Our main goal is to determine how these affect the protection of the rights of suspects and their relationship with existing European fundamental rights protection measures (mainly the European Charter and the ECHR).

1 The right to information in Directive (EU) 2012/13/EU

The Directive (EU) 2012/13/EU on the right to information in criminal proceedings was the second legal instrument accepted as part of the agenda of the Stockholm Programme of better protection of suspected and accused people's procedural rights on 22 May 2012. It was to be transposed into domestic law by 2 June 2014.

This measure governs the suspect's right to be informed about their procedural rights and the charges against them and to have access to the case file and materials in the case. The issue of the right to information has received less attention in case law and practitioner training than the scope of right to access to a lawyer in the previous Directive, and the Right to Information Directive clarifies these important protections.

The Directive builds heavily on rights protected by Articles 6, 47 and 48 of the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union (the Charter), Articles 5 and 6 of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms (the ECHR). During the adoption of the Directive, EU institutions relied heavily on the case law of the European Court of Human Rights (the ECtHR), and therefore there is an opinion that its main function is to articulate those standards as codified norms.¹³

1.1 Main contents of the Directive

The right to information is considered to be a crucial aspect of the overall right to defend oneself. While authorities in some member states provide clear information to suspects about their rights whilst in police custody, others provide little or no information at all.¹⁴

Many other problems have been identified by professionals regarding the right to information in the past few years. Notifications of procedural rights are often written in a very technical language with excessive use of legal terminology, which can prove too difficult to be understood by many accused persons. The notification regarding the right to silence is often

⁹ Directive 2012/13/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of 22 May 2012 on the right to information in criminal proceeding. OJ 2012 L 142, 1.6.2012.

¹⁰ Directive 2013/48/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of 22 October 2013 on the right of access to a lawyer in criminal proceedings and in European arrest warrant proceedings, and on the right to have a third party informed upon deprivation of liberty and to communicate with third persons and with consular authorities while deprived of liberty. OJ 2013 L 294, 6.11.2013.

¹¹ Directive 2016/343 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 9 March 2016 on the strengthening of certain aspects of the presumption of innocence and of the right to be present at the trial in criminal proceedings. OJ 2016 L 65, 11.3.2016.

¹² Directive 2016/800 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 11 May 2016 on procedural safeguards for children who are suspects or accused persons in criminal proceedings. OJ 2016 L 132, 21.5.2016.

¹³ Libby McVeigh – Alex Tinsley: *Roadmap Practitioner Tools: Right to Information Directive*. p. 6. <https://www.fairtrials.org/wp-content/uploads/Right-to-Info-Toolkit-FINAL1.pdf> [30. 04. 2017.]

¹⁴ Jacqueline S. Hodgson: *Safeguarding Suspects' Rights in Europe A Comparative Perspective*. New Criminal Law Review: An International and Interdisciplinary Journal, Vol. 14, No. 4 (Fall 2011), p. 649.

worded in a manner to make it sound unattractive and in some cases draws attention to negative consequences of invoking them. The suspect is often first questioned as a witness and therefore not informed of their rights. Lastly these can result in a waiver of rights without the suspect's proper understanding of the consequences of the decision and can seriously harm the fairness of the trial.¹⁵

It must also be noted that before the Directive was drafted, many aspects of the right to information were not established by national laws. For instance the right to remain silent was not statutory in France and Belgium, while the right to have access to the file was not provided for on behalf of the suspect in the legislation in Estonia, France, Germany and Spain.¹⁶

Article 1: Subject

This Article lays down minimum rules concerning the right to information of suspects and accused persons in relation to their rights in criminal proceedings and to the accusation against them. These rules also apply to persons who are subject to a European Arrest Warrant.

Article 2: Scope

The rules specified in the Directive must be applied in criminal proceedings from the time when a person is made aware by competent authorities that they are suspected or accused of having committed a criminal offence until the conclusion of the proceeding. The Article defines the conclusion as the determination of guilt and also sentencing and the resolution of any appeal. As stated in Recital 16, the Directive should be applied to every suspected and accused person irrespective of their legal status, citizenship or nationality.

In member states where minor offences are sanctioned administratively, e.g. in case of large scale traffic offenses, and only the appeal takes place before a court, the Article provides that the Directive should only be applied to the proceedings before the court.

The ECtHR considered it a violation of Chapter 6 of the ECHR to hear a person as a witness when they are objectively suspected of being involved in committing a crime because in this case an incriminating statement can be produced without the person being informed about their rights.¹⁷ Although the Directive fails to address this situation, and Recitals 19 and 28 make it clear that it is intended to be applied "at the latest before their first official interview by the police or another competent authority" as other authors state, the Directive is to be interpreted in line with the ECHR.¹⁸ This is also enforced by a non-regression clause stated in Article 10.

Article 3: Right to information about rights

Article 6 (1) and (3)c of the ECHR protects suspected people's right to silence and legal assistance and in many cases the ECtHR ruled in its judgments that proper information should be provided for these persons regarding their procedural rights. Otherwise, if suspects cannot invoke their rights due to lack of information by competent national authorities, the criminal proceeding against them cannot be considered as fair. In one case, the Court addressed that a waiver of rights

¹⁵ *Ibid*, p. 14.

¹⁶ Laurens van Puyenbroeck and Gert Vermeulen: *Toward Minimum Procedural Guarantees for the Defence in Criminal Proceedings in the EU*. The International and Comparative Law Quarterly, Vol. 60, No. 4 (October 2011) p. 1032.

¹⁷ Case of *Brusco v. France*, App. no. 1466/07 (Judgment of 14 October 2010)

¹⁸ Libby McVeigh – Alex Tinsley p.

could be accepted if it was made voluntarily but it was also required to be a “knowing and intelligent relinquishment of a right”.¹⁹

However if the waiver is a result of the suspect’s lacking information, it cannot be considered effective. The factors that have to be taken into account when it is being decided whether such conduct is a breach of fairness or not can vary greatly. Some of the criteria in the current ECtHR case law are objective, while others are subjective.²⁰ It is important that the caution be given in a language that the suspect understands.²¹ The circumstances of the caution must also be taken into account when the effectiveness of a relinquishment is being decided on. In a case the Court ruled that “it was unlikely that a mere caution in the words provided for in the domestic law would be enough to enable him to sufficiently comprehend the nature of his rights”.²²

Article 3(1) of the Directive states that suspected and accused people are to be provided promptly oral or written information about certain procedural rights specified by the Article. These are:

- (a) the right of access to a lawyer;
- (b) any entitlement to free legal advice and the conditions for obtaining such advice;
- (c) the right to be informed of the accusation, in accordance with Article 6;
- (d) the right to interpretation and translation;
- (e) the right to remain silent.

The next paragraph determines that the aforementioned information should be given in simple and accessible language and that the authorities should take into account any particular needs of vulnerable suspects or accused persons. The latter instruction can be seen as a general provision on subjective criteria which, as we could see, is already present in the case law of the ECtHR.

Articles 4 and 5: Letter of Rights on arrest

As the Commission states in its press release in relation to the Directive, 8 million criminal proceedings take place in the EU annually. The chance that suspects will be ill-informed about their defence rights is varying across the Member States and in many cases suspects are only informed about their rights orally, in technical and incomprehensible language, or not at all.²³

Due to these tendencies, the Directive points out that suspects and the accused that are arrested or detained shall be provided with a Letter of Rights, a written information sheet about their rights already mentioned in Article 3. This solution is not a new one, as its use was already suggested to the Member States in the European Commission’s Green Paper in 2003.²⁴

¹⁹ Case of *Saman v. Turkey*, App. no. 35292/05 (Judgment of 5 April 2011), para. 32.

²⁰ The weight of subjective factors must be determined for each case individually. The young age of the suspect, their lack of literacy or drug dependency can affect the fact whether the caution fulfils the requirements for the waiver of the right or not. See for example *Panovits v. Cyprus*, App. no. 4268/04 (Judgement of 11 December 2008) para. 67; *Kaciu and Kotorri v. Albania*, Apps. nos. 33192/07 and 33194/07 (Judgment of 25 June 2013), para. 120; and *Pishchalnikov v. Russia*, App. no. 7025/04 (Judgment of 24 September 2009), para. 80.

²¹ See *Saman v. Turkey*, para. 35.

²² See *Panovits v. Cyprus*, para. 74.

²³ Fair trial rights: EU governments endorse law ensuring suspects’ right to information in criminal proceedings. Brussels, 3 December 2010. http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_IP-10-1652_en.htm?locale=en [30.04.2017.]

²⁴ European Commission, Green Paper on Procedural Safeguards for Suspects and Defendants in Criminal Proceedings throughout the European Union, COM(2003)75 final, Brussels, 19 February 2003, section 8.1.

The Letter of Rights should also contain information concerning the application of other rights under national law such as:

- (a) the right of access to the materials of the case;
- (b) the right to have consular authorities and one person informed;
- (c) the right of access to urgent medical assistance;
- (d) the maximum number of hours or days suspects or accused persons may be deprived of liberty before being brought before a judicial authority.

The paper should also contain some basic information about challenging the lawfulness of the arrest, obtaining a review of the detention and making a request for provisional release.

The factors determined by previous ECtHR case law about the proper form and conditions of information should also apply to this information paper. It is specified in the Article that the Letter of Rights shall be drafted in simple and accessible language. The Article also states that Member States authorities must ensure that the suspect receives the Letter of Rights written in a language they understand.

Article 5 says that if the suspect is arrested because of a European Arrest Warrant issued against him, the Letter of Rights should contain information on their rights according to the law implementing Framework Decision 2002/584/JHA in the executing member state.

The Commission stated that it hoped the Letter of Rights would help to avoid miscarriages of justice and reduce the number of appeals while hoping that the efficiency of judicial systems would improve.²⁵

Article 6: Right to information about the accusation

The requirement for the notification of the accusation has a strong connection with the notification of rights as being accused is one of the cases after which the provisions of the Directive must be applied. This is also that phase of the criminal proceedings when persons can decide on their defence and whether they want to enforce certain rights, such as the right to remain silent, or they wish to waive them.

Articles 5(2), 6(3)a and b of the ECHR already cover this topic. The former provides that arrested persons shall be informed about the reasons for arrest and the criminal charges against them. The latter is about minimum rights for every accused person – to be informed about the nature and cause of the accusation against them and have adequate time and facilities for the preparation of their defence.

The ECtHR has already given many decisions on the conformity of information about the accusation. Over the years the Court has adopted a principle regarding Article 6(3)a which is aimed at guaranteeing the right of information for defendants at all stages of the criminal proceeding. It specifies that the accused should be informed about the factual and the legal basis for the procedure since particulars of an offense play a crucial role.²⁶ It also includes the legal classification of facts.²⁷ It is also clearly stated that it is not enough for relevant authorities to provide information when requested to do so.²⁸

Even if the written order properly details relevant legal provisions, it can violate the ECHR without containing any factual circumstances.²⁹ Subjective factors must also be taken into

²⁵ *Ibid.*

²⁶ Case of *Pélissier and Sassi v. France*, App. no. 25444/94 (Judgment of 25 March 1999), para. 51-52.

²⁷ *McVeigh – Tinsley*, p. 26.

²⁸ Case of *Mattoccia v. Italy*, App. no. 23969/94 (Judgment of 5 July 2000), para. 65.

²⁹ Case of *Fox and others v. United Kingdom*, App. no. 12244/86 (Judgment of 30 August 1990), para. 40.

account as in a case it was considered a violation of the Article to question a deaf, mute and illiterate suspect with the assistance of an official sign language interpreter as the suspect was not familiar with that form of sign language.³⁰

The provisions of the Directive heavily resemble the factors laid down by the case law of the ECtHR. According to Article 6, suspected and accused persons shall be provided promptly with information about the criminal act they are suspected or accused of having committed. Paragraph 1 of the Article states that the information shall be detailed enough. A more detailed explanation is given in Recital 27. It states that the person shall be given all necessary information to prepare their defence. According to Recital 28, the information given should contain the time and place of the criminal act, and according to Paragraph (3), not only factual information but also the nature and legal classification of the criminal offence as well as the nature of the participation by the accused person shall be provided.

Paragraph 4 also reflects the existing ECtHR case law³¹ in stating that authorities have to provide information about any reclassifications of the offence so that the suspected or accused person can plan their defence accordingly.

Article 7: Right of access to the materials of the case

At the time of the first questioning of the suspect it is not uncommon that neither the suspect nor their lawyer has access to case files which could affect their decision concerning certain rights. In some member states, access to the files can be restricted by law or by the prosecutor's exceptional power, which can violate the equality of arms principle.³²

Article 6(3)(a), (b) and (c) of the ECHR is related to this issue although not explicitly but the ECtHR dealt with it in a number of judgments. There is an ongoing debate about the Court's opinion about the defence counsel's ability to obtain case files before the first questioning of the defendant. There are some vague expressions in these judgements which can be interpreted in a way to support this claim but this opinion is not shared by other courts.³³

The ECtHR also stated that in accordance with the provisions of Article 6(3)(b), access to case files had to be provided for the accused person in a timely manner before the trial.³⁴ If the inspection of the files is restricted to the lawyer of the defendant, this is not considered as a violation of the Article.³⁵ It was also determined by the Court that the time frame for the counsel to review the file should be determined according to the number of pages it consisted of.³⁶

Article 7 of the Directive also focuses on many of these concerns. Paragraph 1 provides that in case of arresting a person, the documents which are essential to challenge the decision are to be made available for them. The next Paragraph is about the availability of material evidence the competent authority is in possession of. As stated in Paragraph 3 access to the aforementioned materials have to be granted in a due time to allow the effective exercise of the rights of the defence. Paragraph 4 of the Article determines when a request to access certain files can be refused by authorities. A request can be refused:

- if it led to a serious threat to life or fundamental rights of another person and

³⁰ Case of *Z.H. v. Hungary*, App. no 28973/11 (Judgment of 8 November 2012), para. 42-43.

³¹ Case of *Juha Nuutinen v. Finland*, App. no. 45830/99 (Judgment of 24 April 2007), para. 30-32.

³² McVeigh – Tinsley, p. 32.

³³ For more detailed information see McVeigh – Tinsley, p. 33–34.

³⁴ Case of *Beraru v. Romania*, App. no. 40107/04 (Judgement of 18 March 2014), para. 69-70.

³⁵ Case of *Kremzow v. Austria*, App. no. 12350/86 (Judgment of 21 September 1993), para. 52.

³⁶ Case of *Öcalan v. Turkey*, App. no. 46221/99 (Judgment of 12 May 2005), para. 142.

- if it is strictly necessary for safeguarding an important public interest (could prejudice an ongoing investigation or could harm national security).

A decision to refuse a request must be made by a judicial authority or be subject to a judicial review. This Paragraph is also in line with the existing ECtHR case law as it also accepts a public interest immunity principle similar to that of the Directive.³⁷

Lastly, Paragraph 5 states that access to files must be free of charge. Although technically free, defendants can only hold copies of the documents and in case of large files, the costs of photocopying can be significant. In our opinion one effective solution to the reduction of costs is to allow electronic copies to be given to the defendant. Paragraph 70/B. (11) of the Criminal Procedure Code of Hungary (Act XIX of 1998) allows for the accused or their legal counsellor to request an electronic copy of case files. It also says that if the files are available in electronic form, the copies must be presented on electronic data carriers. The only downside of the electronic form of the documents is that the Code does not accept it as authentic.

2 The presumption of innocence and of the right to be present at trial in criminal proceedings in Directive (EU) 2016/343

On 9 March 2016, the European Parliament and the Council adopted Directive (EU) 2016/343 on the strengthening of certain aspects of the presumption of innocence and of the right to be present at trial in criminal proceedings.

The Directive is the fourth legislative measure that has been passed since the adoption of the Council's Roadmap on procedural rights for suspects and accused persons in 2009.

The presumption of innocence and the right to a fair trial are enshrined in Articles 47 and 48 of the Charter, Article 6 of the ECHR, Article 14 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (the ICCPR) and Article 11 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

After the Directives regarding the three previous measures, this new Directive tries to enhance the right to a fair trial through the adoption of common minimum rules on certain points of the presumption of innocence and the right to be present at trial. This should result in the increase of trust between the Member States in the field of criminal justice and thereby it facilitates mutual recognition.

The first three measures on the basis of the Roadmap were adopted within a rather short time frame: Directive 2010/64/EU on the right to interpretation and translation (measure A) was adopted on 20 October 2010; Directive 2012/13/EU on the right to information (measure B) was adopted on 22 May 2012; and Directive 2013/48/EU on the right of access to a lawyer (measure C1) was adopted on 22 October 2013.

The European Commission has been examining the presumption of innocence for a long time. The Green paper on the presumption of innocence³⁸ from 2006 already indicated that the Commission was willing to include the presumption of innocence in a legislative instrument if there was a need to do so. Although the presumption of innocence was not one of the measures covered by the 2009 Roadmap, Point 2 of this Roadmap made it clear that proposals on other topics could be submitted. Therefore in November 2013, the Commission presented a package of

³⁷ Laurens van Puyenbroeck and Gert Vermeulen: p. 1024.

³⁸ Proposal for a Directive of the European Parliament and of the Council on the strengthening of certain aspects of the presumption of innocence and of the right to be present at trial in criminal proceedings, Brussels, 27.11.2013 COM(2013) 821 final 2013/0407 (COD)

three further measures to complete the rollout of the Roadmap as integrated in the Stockholm Programme: a proposal for a Directive on provisional legal aid (measure C2), a proposal for a Directive on procedural safeguards for children (measure E) and a proposal for a Directive on the presumption of innocence (the “example” of the Stockholm Programme). Article 6(3) of the Treaty on European Union (TEU) states that fundamental rights, as guaranteed by the ECHR and as they result from the constitutional traditions common to the Member States, constitute general principles of EU law.

2.1 Description of the main contents of the Directive

The approach of the new Directive is rather broad as it deals not only with the presumption of innocence and connected rights such as the right to remain silent, but it equally states the right to be present at one’s trial. The new rules apply to all people suspected or accused in criminal proceedings.

Article 1: Subject

Article 1 confirms that the Directive is intended to lay down minimum rules on “certain aspects of the right to the presumption of innocence in criminal proceeding” and the right to be present at trial in criminal proceedings. The Directive is not intended, therefore, to be an exhaustive study of the principle, and the ECHR will still be the main guide to those aspects which are not included in the text.

Article 2: Scope

The Directive applies to suspects or accused persons in criminal proceedings from the very start of criminal proceedings, even before the time when the suspects are made aware by competent authorities of the fact that they are suspected or accused of having committed a criminal offence. It applies until the conclusion of such proceedings, until the final judgement is delivered.

The right to be presumed innocent encompasses different needs and degrees of protection regarding natural persons and legal persons as recognized in the case law of the Court of Justice on the right not to incriminate oneself. This Directive takes into account these differences and therefore only applies to natural persons.

Article 3: Presumption of innocence

Article 3 basically repeats Article 6(2) of the ECHR and Article 48(1) of the EU Charter: suspects and accused persons should be presumed innocent until proven guilty according to law. Article 3 is a simple restatement of the principle. It says that “Member States shall ensure that suspects and accused persons are presumed innocent until proven guilty according to law”. There is no attempt to articulate the nature of the provision further or set out the core aspects of the presumption for the purposes of the Directive.

Article 4: Public references to guilt

As one of the basic aspects of the principle of presumption of innocence, the ECtHR established the fact that a court or a public official may not publicly present suspects or accused persons as if they were guilty of an offence if they have not been tried and convicted by a final

judgment³⁹. According to the case law of the ECtHR this principle should furthermore apply to all public authorities⁴⁰.

Article 4(3) explains a general exception: the obligation not to refer to suspects or accused persons as being guilty should not prevent public authorities from publicly disseminating information on the criminal proceedings if this is strictly necessary for reasons relating to the criminal investigation. This could be the case, for example, when video material is released and the public is asked to help in identifying the alleged perpetrator of a criminal offence.⁴¹

Article 5: Presentation of suspects and accused persons

According to the article, the “Member States shall take appropriate measures to ensure that suspects and accused persons are not presented as being guilty, in court or in public, through the use of measures of physical restraint.”

It means that competent authorities should also abstain from presenting suspects or accused persons in court or in public while wearing prison clothes, so they are required to avoid giving the impression that those persons are guilty.

Article 6: Burden of proof

Article 6 deals with the burden of proof. It requires the Member States to “ensure that the burden of proof in establishing the guilt of suspects and accused persons is on the prosecution”. This is an important issue. The burden of proof refers to the fact that it is the prosecution that must prove the case against the accused. The initial draft of Article 6 initially contained an article permitting the burden of proof to be shifted to the defence. The European Parliament’s Civil Liberties Committee successfully proposed an amendment deleting this provision on the shift of the burden of proof. The Article reflects an ECtHR principle⁴² which is considered as a correct balance between the protection of public interests (the needs of prosecution) and the right of the defence.

Article 7: Right to remain silent and right not to incriminate oneself

Article 7 states that the suspect has the right to remain silent “in relation to the offence that they are suspected or accused of having committed”. This should surely have been extended to the right to silence in relation to the commission of any offence.

The right to remain silent and the right not to incriminate oneself are not specifically mentioned in the ECHR, but the ECtHR has derived these rights from the right to a fair procedure under Article 6 of the ECHR.⁴³

The Commission defined the right to remain silent and the right not to incriminate oneself as absolute rights, which means that they can be exercised without any conditions or qualifications and that there are no negative consequences attached to the exercise of these rights.⁴⁴

³⁹ See Case of *Minelli v. Switzerland*, App. no. 8660/79 (Judgment of 17 December 1980)

⁴⁰ See Case of *Allenet de Ribemont v. France*, App. no. 15175/89 (Judgment of 10 February 1995)

⁴¹ Steven Cras and Anze Erbeznik: *The Directive on the Presumption of Innocence and the Right to Be Present at Trial*, *Eucrim* 1/2016, p. 29.

⁴² See, *inter alia*, ECtHR cases *Salabiaku v. France*, App. no. 10519/83 (Judgment of 7 October 1988), *Barberà, Messegué and Jabardo v. Spain*, *Telfner v. Austria*, App. no. 33501/96 (Judgment of 20 March 2001)

⁴³ See, e.g., ECtHR Case of *Funke v. France*, para. 44.

⁴⁴ Steven Cras and Anze Erbeznik: p. 31.

Suspects or accused persons should be promptly informed of their right to remain silent according to Directive 2012/13/EU. Such information should also refer to the content of the right to remain silent and the consequences of renouncing it and of enforcing it.

Article 7(3) notes that “the exercise of the right to remain silent and of the right not to incriminate oneself shall not be used against a suspect or accused person and shall not be considered as evidence that the person concerned has committed the offence which he or she is suspected or accused of having committed”. This has to be welcomed and appears to go further than the ECtHR which has found that the decision of an accused person to remain silent throughout criminal proceedings may carry consequences, such as ‘adverse inferences’ being drawn from the silence.

Articles 8 and 9: Relating to the right to be present at trial and the right to a new trial

The provisions regarding trials in absentia, which the Commission proposed in Paragraphs 2 and 3 of Article 8, were more problematic. Here, the Commission had almost copy-pasted provisions from Framework Decision 2009/299/JHA on trials in absentia.

The ECtHR has confirmed that this is implicit in the right to a fair trial by way of a public hearing⁴⁵ and that it is difficult to see how anyone can exercise their defence rights without being present at their own trial.⁴⁶

The Directive has made an important point clear. In fact, in the Framework Decision it was not clear whether in respect of suspects or accused persons whose location is unknown a trial in absentia could be held and whether the resulting decision, including a custodial sentence, could be enforced immediately, in particular if the person concerned has been apprehended.

However, important conditions have to be set out. Firstly, the Member States may only use the possibility to hold a trial in absentia if they have undertaken “reasonable efforts” to locate suspects or accused persons. Secondly, the Member States must inform those persons, in particular upon being apprehended, of the decision taken in absentia as well as of the possibility to challenge this decision and the right to a new trial or other legal remedy.⁴⁷

Article 9 establishes a remedy (established by the ECtHR) in cases in which the right to be present at trial has not been observed. In this case, there is an obligation to provide for a re-trial.⁴⁸

3 Conclusion

The Stockholm Programme was right when determining that fair trial and the right to defence does not only mean the right to access a lawyer but has many other dimensions covered by the measures of the programme. To create an efficient system of the suspect’s rights, it is important to find a balance and appropriate timing for them. Presumption of innocence is a crucial principle to allow a fair trial but it needs other measures to be realized in practice. Without the access to interpretation and translation, the right to information can be meaningless. Even if the suspected or accused person is informed about their rights, they probably cannot decide on a proper defence strategy without help from a defence counsel.

⁴⁵ Case of *Jacobsson v. Sweden*, App. no. 16970/90 (Judgment of 19 February 1998)

⁴⁶ Debbie Sayers: The new Directive on the presumption of innocence: protecting the ‘golden thread’ <http://eulawanalysis.blogspot.de/2015/11/the-new-directive-on-presumption-of.html> [30.04.2017.]

⁴⁷ Steven Cras and Anze Erbeznik: p. 33.

⁴⁸ Case of *Colozza v. Italy*, App. no. 9024/80 (Judgment of 12 February 1985)

As we could see, both Directives are built heavily on existing ECHR regulations and the ECtHR case law regarding the issue. The system created by the Convention and the Court has serious limitations in their mechanism as it is not generally observed in all cases. The EU level action can force the Member States to adopt the same level of protection for every proceeding.⁴⁹ The realisation of EU legislation on this basis is certainly a move towards enhancing integration between the two major European systems of human rights protection. Continuing this process could create a more complete and effective European human rights protection system, which is implemented especially in terms of guarantees and judicial protection.⁵⁰

Dr. habil Anita Nagy
associate professor, the University of Miskolc
Faculty of Law, Institute of Criminal Sciences

dr. László Dornfeld
2nd year PhD student at the University of
Miskolc
Faculty of Law

Recenzent: mjr. JUDr. Daniela Benedeková, PhD.

⁴⁹ T.N.B.M Spronken and D.L.F. de Vocht: *EU Policy to Guarantee Procedural Rights in Criminal Proceedings: "Step by Step"*. 37 North Carolina Journal of International Law and Commercial Regulation (2011-2012), p. 483.

⁵⁰ Stefania Negri: *Realising a European Area of Justice through Harmonised Protection of Procedural Rights and Enhanced Integration between the EU and the ECHR Legal Systems*. 2014, Conf. Int'l Dr. p. 103.