CONSEJO GENERAL DEL PODER JUDICIAL
ESCUELA JUDICIAL

ejtn

Red Europea de Formación Judicial (REFJ)
European Judicial Training Network (EJTN)
Réseau Européen de Formation Judiciaire (REFJ)

ONLINE COURSE
The judge in the European Judicial Area: Civil and Commercial matters
2011 EDITION

MODULE III

UNIT XIII

Access to justice. Crime victims (Directive 2004/80 and Framework Decision 15-3-01) Mediation (Directive 2008/52). Legal aid (Directive 2002/8)

AUTHOR

Francisco de Paula PUIG BLANES

Senior Judge.
Member of the Spanish Judicial Cooperation Network (REJUE)

Con el apoyo de la Unión Europea
With the support of The European Union
Avec le soutien de l'Union Européenne

SUMMARY

Since the Treaty of Maastricht (and subsequently those of Amsterdam, Nice and Lisbon) the Justice policy of the European Union has been gathering importance. Thanks to this policy, citizens should not see their possibilities of obtaining effective judicial protection affected by the fact that a dispute to which they are a party has links to more than one EU country.

This regulatory work has been significant both in criminal and civil matters with rules facilitating judicial cooperation, regulatory harmonisation and even establishing unified procedures (such as the European order for payment or small claims procedures).

This unit analyses three areas in which the EU has legislated and in which it is seeking to facilitate access to Justice in detail: making it easier for victims residing in a different Member State to the one in which the offence was committed to obtain compensation, mechanisms for obtaining the right to legal aid in another country, and the promotion of types of alternative dispute resolution (ADR) such as mediation, so useful in cases where the elements of the disputed legal relationship are linked to different states.

Con el apoyo de la Unión Europea
With the support of The European Union
Avec le soutien de l'Union Européenne

ACCESS TO JUSTICE. CRIME VICTIMS (DIRECTIVE 2004/80 AND FRAMEWORK DECISION 15-3-01) MEDIATION (Directive 2008/52). LEGAL AID (DIRECTIVE 2002/8)

ACCESS TO JUSTICE

The existence of legal relationships with links to different states generates significant problems in the case of discrepancies, as this often means it is necessary to take recourse to the Courts of Justice of a different state to the one of which the parties affected are nationals or residents. In view of how this affects the right to effective judicial protection, efforts are being made at an international (and essentially European) level to remove said obstacles.

A first step on this road was taken by the Council of Europe which approved two Recommendations that, despite their non-binding, general nature (not specifically addressing transnational proceedings), did represent a significant advance at the time. They are Recommendation (81) 7 of 14 May on measures facilitating access to justice and Recommendation (84) 5 of 28 February on principles of civil procedure designed to improve the functioning of justice.

In the sphere of the European Union, in view of the regulatory possibilities opened up with the reforms carried out by the Treaties of Maastricht and Amsterdam, the first big political push in the field of Justice came from the European Council held at Tampere (Finland) between 15 and 16 October 1999 (concentrating on aspects of Justice and Home Affairs). One of the areas addressed by its conclusions was access to justice in Europe. Thus, and in reference to judicial assistance and the unification of procedures, it stated that: “30. The European Council invites the Council, on the basis of proposals by the Commission, to establish minimum standards ensuring an adequate level of legal aid in cross-border cases throughout the Union as well as special common procedural rules for simplified and accelerated cross-border litigation on small consumer and commercial claims, as well as maintenance claims, and on uncontested claims. Alternative, extra-judicial procedures should also be created by Member States”. With regard to the protection of victims, it indicated that: “32. Having regard to the Commission's communication, minimum standards should be drawn up on the protection of the victims of crime, in particular on crime victims’ access to justice and on their rights to compensation for damages, including legal costs. In addition, national programmes should be set up to finance measures, public and non-governmental, for assistance to and protection of victims”.

Following the boost given by the Tampere European Council, once its validity had concluded, the next major political step in the field of judicial cooperation in the European Union took the form of the Conclusions of the

European Council held in Brussels in November 2004, which approved the Hague Programme (also called "Tampere II"). In relation to access to justice, it stated as follows: "The European Council underlines the need further to enhance work on the creation of a Europe for citizens and the essential role that the setting up of a European Area for Justice will play in this respect. A number of measures have already been carried out. Further efforts should be made to facilitate access to justice and judicial cooperation as well as the full employment of mutual recognition. It is of particular importance that borders between countries in Europe no longer constitute an obstacle to the settlement of civil law matters or to the bringing of court proceedings and the enforcement of decisions in civil matters …"

Finally, and with the conclusion of the term of validity of the Hague Programme, the current political push in this field is the Stockholm Programme ("An open and secure Europe serving and protecting citizens") approved by the European Council of 11 December 2009, and whose stated political priority is: "A Europe of law and justice: The achievement of a European area of justice must be consolidated so as to move beyond the current fragmentation. Priority should be given to mechanisms that facilitate access to justice, so that people can enforce their rights throughout the Union ...". With regard to the instruments for implementing it, it indicates: "3.4.1. Providing easier access to justice. Access to justice in the European judicial area must be made easier, particularly in cross-border proceedings. At the same time, efforts must continue to improve alternative methods of settling disputes, particularly in consumer law. Action is needed to help people overcome the language barriers that obstruct their access to justice …"

This is the framework for the actions of the European Union in the three spheres that we will now go on to analyse: protecting the victims of crime, mediation and legal aid.

Victims of Crime (Directive 2004/80 and Framework Decision 15.03.2.001)

Anyone who is a victim of a crime needs special protection according to modern victimology, which centres on establishing programmes providing aid and assistance, proper management of victims' intervention in the criminal proceedings (include protective measures), and the establishment of programmes of compensation in some cases.

If the offence was committed in a country other than the one in which the victim resides, the difficulties are greater, and this is where the European Union (one of whose fundamental freedoms is the free movement of persons around its territory) has established the obligation (following the reform implemented by the Treaty of Amsterdam) of guaranteeing that free movement is ensured in conditions of security and justice.

The precedents for its regulatory activities (together with United Nations Resolution 40/34 of 29 November 1985 "Declaration of Basic Principles of Justice for Victims of Crime and Abuse of Power") include the Council of

Europe's European Convention on the Compensation of Victims of Violent Crimes dated 24 de November 1983, Recommendation (85) 11 of 28 June 1985 to the Member States on the position of the victim in the framework of criminal law and procedure, and Recommendation (87) 21 of 17 September 1987 on the assistance to victims and the prevention of victimisation.

In the sphere of the European Union, compensation for victims of crime was referred to in the judgment in case 186/87 ("Ian William Cowan v Trésor Public) of 2 February 1989, in which the Court of the Justice of the European Communities stated that the corollary of the freedom of movement includes the adoption of the measures necessary to facilitate compensation for persons who are victims of crime on the same basis as nationals. Furthermore, on 12 September 1989 the European Parliament adopted a Resolution on the compensation of victims of violent crime. With these elements, with the corresponding legislative process underway, the two pieces of legislation on the compensation of victims of crime that exist today were adopted.

Council Framework Decision 2001/220/JHA, dated 15 March 2001

The first of these is Council Framework Decision 2001/220/JHA of 15 March 2001 on the standing of victims in criminal proceedings, a victim being understood (Article 1.a) as a natural person who has suffered harm, including physical or mental injury, emotional suffering or economic loss, directly caused by acts or omissions that are in violation of the criminal law of a Member State. The Framework Decision regulates the principles and rights of victims in criminal proceedings, the aim of the instrument being to ensure victims have a real and appropriate role in the criminal justice system, and that they are treated with due respect for their personal dignity during the proceedings. The Framework Decision recognises rights such as the right to be heard and to present evidence (Article 3), information (Article 4), legal advice or legal aid when justified (Article 6), communication safeguards (Article 5), refund of expenses (Article 7), or appropriate protection (Article 8). With regard to the right to be compensated, the Framework Decision contemplates the possibility to obtain compensation paid for by the offender; Article 9 states as follows: "1. Each Member State shall ensure that victims of criminal acts are entitled to obtain a decision within reasonable time limits on compensation by the offender in the course of criminal proceedings, except where, in certain cases, national law provides for compensation to be awarded in another manner. 2. Each Member State shall take appropriate measures to encourage the offender to provide adequate compensation to victims. 3. Unless urgently required for the purpose of criminal proceedings, recoverable property belonging to victims which is seized in the course of criminal proceedings shall be returned to them without delay."

Council Directive 2004/80/EC of 29 April 2004 relating to compensation to crime victims

The second instrument issued, Council Directive 2004/80/EC of 29 April 2004 relating to compensation to crime victims, supplements the foregoing one with regard to compensation for victims, but from a perspective that is completely different to that of the Framework Decision as it refers to the compensation to be paid by states (not by the offenders, as in the case of the Framework Decision). To that end, it envisages (Article 12) that all Member States shall ensure that their national rules provide for the existence of a scheme on compensation to victims of violent intentional crimes committed in their respective territories, which guarantees fair and appropriate compensation to victims. On this basis, the Directive seeks to ensure that the victim's chances of obtaining compensation are not harmed by the fact of living in a different Member State to the one in which the offence was committed. To that end, it creates a system (notwithstanding other more favourable ones that may be adopted between certain Member States in accordance with Article 17) under which the victims of crime can always have recourse to an authority in their Member State of residence in order to mitigate any practical or linguistic difficulty that may arise when claiming compensation with regard to the state where the offence was committed. This system should include the necessary provisions to allow the crime victim to find the information he/she needs to present the application and ensure efficient cooperation between the participant authorities. This will entail the effective implementation of the right recognised in Article 1 of the Directive, according to which Member States shall ensure that where a violent intentional crime has been committed in a Member State other than the Member State where the applicant for compensation is habitually resident, the applicant shall have the right to submit the application to an authority or any other body in the latter Member State.

The mechanism created consists of communication between authorities: that of the state of residence (which the Directive terms the "assisting authority or authorities") and that of the state in which the offence was committed that decides on the compensation ("deciding authority or authorities"). This communication with regard to the transmission of the application is made using the form approved by a Commission Decision of 19 April 2006 establishing standard forms for the transmission of applications and decisions pursuant to Council Directive 2004/80/EC relating to compensation to crime victims. In any event, the assistance provided by the authorities to the victim also covers the presentation of applications, offering appropriate information and help (Article 9) if the deciding authority decides, in accordance with the law of its Member State, to hear the applicant. This hearing may be held: (a) directly by the deciding authority, in accordance with the law of its Member State, through the use in particular of telephone- or video-conferencing (this may only take place in cooperation with the assisting authority and on a voluntary basis without the possibility of coercive measures being imposed by the deciding authority), or (b) by the assisting authority, in accordance with the law of its Member State, which will subsequently transmit a report of the hearing to the deciding authority.

The Directive established a term for the implementation of its rules that ended on 1 January 2006; by July 2011, the Judicial Atlas in civil matters contained the information on national implementation performed by all the states (with the exception of Greece, France, Malta and Bulgaria). In the case of Spain, the rules are contained in Law 35/1995 of 11 December, on aid and assistance to the victims of violent crime and offences against sexual freedom, implemented in regulatory terms by Royal Decree 738/1997 of 23 May; Law 32/1999 of 8 October on solidarity with the victims of terrorism; Royal Decree 1912/1999, of 17 December, which approves the Regulations enforcing Law 32/1999, of 8 October on solidarity with the victims of terrorism; Royal Decree 288/2003 of 7 March (Regulations on aid and compensation to victims of terrorist offences); and Organic Law 1/2004 of 28 December on integral measures of protection against gender-based violence.

Finally, the Stockholm Programme ("An open and secure Europe serving and protecting citizens"), approved by the European Council on 11 December 2009, envisages the creation of a single global legal instrument on the protection of victims, merging Council Directive 2004/80/EC of 19 April relating to compensation to crime victims and Council Framework Decision 2001/220/JHA of 15 March 2001 on the standing of victims in criminal proceedings, on the basis of an assessment of these two instruments. The Action Plan applying the Stockholm Programme of 20 April 2010 envisaged this instrument being prepared in the course of 2011.

Mediation (Directive 2008/52)

Faced with the complexity of society today and the increase in legal relationships that generate conflict, an exclusively court-based response is not possible. For that reason, one of the options that is becoming increasingly important is the promotion of alternative dispute resolution (ADR) mechanisms that seek to achieve consensual solutions to disputes with the advantages that such agreed solutions entail (a lessening of tension, the possibility of relations between the parties involved continuing ...) and the reduction in costs that this may represent. Among the different types of mechanism, mediation is considered particularly important where a third party can attempt to bring the parties to the dispute together with specific proposals for resolving the same. This option offers significant advantages, as it is not subject to formalities, is formally flexible (guided and organised by the mediator) meaning that if an agreement is reached, it will have been the parties themselves that resolved the dispute, and this may mean they are prepared to voluntarily comply with the obligations derived from the agreement reached, avoiding complex enforcement procedures. In processes with a transnational component, the advantages of mediation are multiplied as it makes it possible to overcome the obstacles that the international nature of a process entails.

The precedents to the regulation introduced by the European Union can be found in the Council of Europe, author of two Recommendations designed to

promote mediation (not just in transnational procedures). These are Recommendation R (98) 1 of 21 January 1998 of the Committee of Ministers to member states on family mediation and Recommendation R (2002) 10 of 18 September 2002 on mediation in civil matters.

At European Union level, and following a complex process of preparation, Directive 2008/52/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 21 May 2008 on certain aspects of mediation in civil and commercial matters was passed, which (as set out in its preamble) was designed to further promote the use of mediation and ensure that parties having recourse to mediation can rely on a predictable legal framework. In this regard, mediation (it only addresses this mechanism and no other forms of ADR), means a structured process, however named or referred to, whereby two or more parties to a dispute attempt by themselves, on a voluntary basis, to reach an agreement on the settlement of their dispute with the assistance of a mediator. This process may be initiated by the parties or suggested or ordered by a court or prescribed by the law of a Member State. Article 12 of the Directive sets a term for the transposition of the same, ending on 21 May 2011.

The Directive (operational in all the states of the European Union except Denmark), is applicable to cross-border disputes in civil and commercial matters, except as regards rights and obligations which are not at the parties' disposal under the relevant applicable law. In particular, it does not apply to revenue, customs or administrative matters or to the liability of the State for acts and omissions in the exercise of State authority (*acta iure imperii*). This limitation to cross-border matters established in the Directive (according to the Preamble) does not mean that Member States cannot apply its provisions to domestic mediation procedures, although this possibility is not expressly envisaged due to the principle of subsidiarity, which limits the possible scope of action of the European Union to those cases in which regulatory intervention affects the functioning of the internal market.

If we go into the specific content of the indications that the Directive establishes for the Member States to be applied in their national legislation, we can see that the figure of the mediator and the conditions he/she must meet play a leading role, concentrating on two elements: training and the conditions in which he/she performs his/her duties. The aim here is to strengthen trust in this alternative dispute resolution mechanism, promoting recourse to the same. To be precise, and with regard to training, the Directive makes a general proclamation that the Member States shall encourage the initial and further training of mediators in order to ensure that the mediation is conducted in an effective, impartial and competent way in relation to the parties. Meanwhile, and with regard to the conditions in which mediation is performed, the Directive declares itself in favour of self-regulation mechanisms and does not impose strict rules in this regard, indicating that the states shall encourage, by any means which they consider appropriate, the development of, and adherence to, voluntary codes of conduct by mediators and organisations providing mediation services, as well as other effective quality control mechanisms. Among the

existing codes of conduct, the most general one at a European level is the one that (without being a regulatory instrument) has received the backing of the European Commission: the European Code of Conduct for Mediators.

Together with the above, one of the matters raised in relation to the different alternative dispute resolution mechanisms is the extent to which it is possible to oblige the parties to take recourse to them, or whether it should be they who decide to enquire about the intervention of a mediator (either on their own initiative or as a result of information sessions explaining the option of taking recourse to mediation and the possibilities it offers). In this way, the legal systems of some Member States establish the obligation to take recourse to ADR prior to bringing a case before the courts. On the other hand, ADR is generally optional, either because the parties accept the proposal of the judge or because one of the parties takes the initiative and the other accepts. Faced with these possibilities, Article 5 of the mediation Directive adopts an open stance, recognising as valid both voluntary recourse systems, those based on information sessions and even compulsory recourse (although in the latter case, what is obligatory is clearly the mediation process, not the ensuing agreement, which will always have to be agreed by the parties).

Another of the questions raised by the Directive is the one regarding the possibility of using the content of the mediation as evidence in the trial. In this regard, the premise is that during the mediation process and the exchanges of opinions between the parties and the mediator, statements and offers of negotiation may be made that must necessarily be confidential, because the knowledge that they may be disseminated could prevent the parties from making such offers. This guarantees that the parties will be frank and sincere in their communications during the procedure. This confidentiality obligation affects both the parties and the mediators, meaning (Article 7) that, unless the parties agree otherwise, neither mediators nor those involved in the administration of the mediation process shall be compelled to give evidence in civil and commercial judicial proceedings or arbitration regarding information arising out of or in connection with a mediation process, except where this is necessary for overriding considerations of public policy, in particular when required to ensure the protection of the best interests of children or to prevent harm to the physical or psychological integrity of a person.

Finally, and as an essential element with regard to promoting mediation, the rapid enforcement of any agreement reached is essential. To that end, the Directive indicates (Article 6) that the Member States shall ensure that it is possible for the parties, or for one of them with the explicit consent of the others, to request that the content of a written agreement resulting from mediation be made enforceable.

As far as the national implementation of the Directive is concerned, the states are currently in the process of doing so, and by July 2011 (according to the European Judicial Atlas) Greece, Italy, Malta, Portugal, Slovenia, Bulgaria, Estonia and Hungary had completed such implementation. In the case of Spain, the corresponding reform was implemented in relation to mediation in family

matters in Law 15/2005, of 8 July, and the Draft Bill on Mediation in Civil and Commercial Matters is going through the approval process.

Legal Aid (Directive 2002/8)

The right to a fair and public hearing in full equality is a fundamental right appearing in Article 10 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and in Article 14 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, of 19 December 1966. At a European level, this right is recognised in Article 6 of the Rome Convention of 4 November 1950, on Human Rights (in particular the first paragraph which applies to civil matters). The implementation of the same includes the need for a proper defence, although (according to case law from the European Court of Human Rights), the parties do not necessarily have to be assisted by legal professionals in all civil proceedings, the requirement of the intervention of a lawyer being a question that must be assessed on a case-by-case basis, in view of the complexity of the trial in question and the socio-economic status of the interested party.

Recognition of the right to a fair and public hearing is also directly set out in the European Union law in the Charter of Fundamental Rights approved at the Summit of Heads of State in Nice in December 2000, made binding by the Treaty of Lisbon (except in the cases of the United Kingdom and Poland, by virtue of an Additional Protocol). Article 47 states: “Everyone whose rights and freedoms guaranteed by the law of the Union are violated has the right to an effective remedy before a tribunal in compliance with the conditions laid down in this Article. Everyone is entitled to a fair and public hearing within a reasonable time by an independent and impartial tribunal previously established by law. Everyone shall have the possibility of being advised, defended and represented. Legal aid shall be made available to those who lack sufficient resources in so far as such aid is necessary to ensure effective access to justice”. This precept contains the specific proclamation of the right to legal aid, although (and assuming the doctrine of the European Court of Human Rights indicated above), it is not absolute, but “in so far as such aid is necessary to ensure effective access to justice”, which will depend on the complexity of the trial and the circumstances of the case.

Further to the above, when someone is involved in legal proceedings in another state (either as claimant or as defendant), the difficulties increase, as apart from the inevitable complication of dealing with a judicial and legal system different to one’s own, there is the added factor of the claimant being subject to *cautio iudicatum solvi*, which entails the requirement for the foreign party to provide a bond to cover the payment of the costs of the proceedings in case he/she is ultimately unsuccessful. This exception disappeared in the case of Spain following the approval of the 2000 Civil Procedure Act, due to the criticism received from case law and legal scholars, although there are several international treaties which refer to it with a view to preventing its application. However, the problem is exacerbated in cases affecting persons with very

limited financial resources. This is what has led to the emergence of international instruments that aim to make it possible to seek and obtain recognition in one state of the right to bring legal proceedings free of charge in another. Until the intervention of the European Union (and together with several bilateral instruments), on a multilateral level, the instruments adopted were the Convention on International Access to Justice, done in the Hague on 25 October 1980 and the European Agreement on the Transmission of Applications for Legal Aid, done in Strasbourg on 27 January 1977.

The European Union issued Council Directive 2002/8/EC of 27 January 2003 to improve access to justice in cross-border disputes by establishing minimum common rules relating to legal aid for such disputes. It represents an important step forward in terms of the situation existing up to that point because, together with establishing a mechanism for the transmission of applications for recognition of the right to legal aid, it sets common minimum rules regarding legal aid in cross-border disputes.

Its scope encompasses all cross-border disputes in civil and commercial matters, regardless of the nature of the jurisdictional body. However, this does not include revenue, customs and administrative matters.

It only applies (Article 4) to Union citizens and third-country nationals residing lawfully in a Member State with the exception of Denmark, and the right will be recognised (Article 5) based on the economic situation of said persons, taking into account not just earnings but a group of circumstances that includes: income, capital or family situation, including an assessment of the resources of persons who are financially dependent on the applicant. In addition to the quantitative limits set out above, and even in the cases of scenarios and persons where the right to legal aid could be recognised, with a view to avoiding abuses, the Directive establishes the possible provision of mechanisms that seek to avoid unfounded claims being brought (Article 6).

The minimum content of recognition of the right is established in Article 3 as follows: (a) pre-litigation advice with a view to reaching a settlement prior to bringing legal proceedings; (b) legal assistance and representation in court; (c) exemption from the cost of proceedings of the recipient, including the costs and the fees to persons mandated by the court to perform acts during the proceedings, or assistance in paying them (interpretation services, document translation, travel expenses); (d) in Member States in which a losing party is liable for the costs of the opposing party, if the recipient loses the case, the legal aid shall cover the costs incurred by the opposing party, if it would have covered such costs had the recipient been domiciled or habitually resident in the Member State in which the court is sitting. The above benefits are not obligatory in proceedings especially designed to enable litigants to make their case in person, except when the courts or any other competent authority otherwise decide in order to ensure equality of parties or in view of the complexity of the case.

Together with the above, which are the expenses of the cross-border dispute for which legal aid is sought, it also includes those necessary for the

application and processing of the aid in the Member State in which the applicant is domiciled or in which he/she habitually resides and which are set out in Article 8: (a) costs relating to the assistance of a local lawyer or any other person entitled by the law to give legal advice, incurred in that Member State until the application for legal aid has been received, in accordance with this Directive, in the Member State where the court is sitting; (b) the translation of the application and of the necessary supporting documents when the application is submitted to the authorities in that Member State.

However, in addition to the possible recognition of the right in full, it also envisages the possibility of limited or restricted aid being granted (supposedly for people who surpass the minimum level of resources without exceeding a higher threshold, also legally established). Member States are authorised to require that the recipients of legal aid pay reasonable contributions to the procedural costs. Moreover, it also establishes that the internal rules must put in place refund mechanisms in the event the financial situation of the interested party improves and a review in the event the applicant provided inaccurate information regarding his/her conditions and received aid unfairly. Finally, Article 9.4 of the Directive also allows for a re-examination of the conditions in the different stages of the trial.

Legal aid shall be granted or refused by the competent authority of the Member State in which the court is sitting (Article 12), although (Article 13) applications may be presented either to the competent authority of the Member State in which the applicant is domiciled or habitually resident (the transmitting authority which refers the matter to the authority that has to decide on the recognition of the right), or to the competent authority of the Member State in which the court is sitting or where the decision is to be enforced (receiving authority). With this procedure in mind, the Directive was supplemented by two decisions that prepared the forms that must obligatorily be used. The first one is Commission Decision 2005/630/EC, of 26 August 2005 establishing a form for the transmission of legal aid applications under Council Directive 2003/8/EC, and the second is Commission Decision 2004/844/EC of 9 November 2004 establishing a form for legal aid applications under Council Directive 2003/8/EC to improve access to justice in cross-border disputes by establishing minimum common rules relating to legal aid for such disputes.

Due to its legal status as a directive, the instrument requires national implementation (the deadline was 30 November 2004), which has been performed in some states (in July 2011, the Civil Judicial Atlas was only lacking information on Romania, Bulgaria and Greece). As far as Spain is concerned, this adaptation was performed by Law 16/2005 of 18 July.

LINKS

European Judicial Atlas in Civil and Commercial matters

http://ec.europa.eu/justice_home/judicialatlascivil

European Judicial Network for Civil and Commercial matters

http://ec.europa.eu/civiljustice/

Eur-Lex (EU Legislation)

http://eur-lex.europa.eu

SCAD-Plus (European legislation by areas – Justice)

http://europa.eu/legislation_summaries/justice_freedom_security/index_en.htm

Case Law of the Court of Justice of the European Union

http://curia.europa.eu

Council of Europe: Criminal matters (European Committee on Crime Problems (CDPC))

http://www.coe.int/t/dghl/standardsetting/cdpc/default_EN.asp?

Council of Europe Access to Justice (CEPEJ – European Commission for the Efficiency of Justice)

http://www.coe.int/t/dghl/cooperation/cepej/textes/ListeRecRes_en.asp

Case Law of the European Court of Human Rights

http://www.echr.coe.int/ECHR

Con el apoyo de la Unión Europea
With the support of The European Union
Avec le soutien de l'Union Européenne