The Implementation of the European Arrest Warrant in the Republic of Slovenia

Katja Šugman Stubbs

eucrim
European Law Forum: Prevention • Investigation • Prosecution

Article

AUTHOR

Katja Šugman Stubbs

CITATION SUGGESTION

K. Šugman Stubbs, "The Implementation of the European Arrest Warrant in the Republic of Slovenia", 2007, Vol. 2(3), eucrim, pp133–138. DOI: https://doi.org/10.30709/eucrim-2007-010

Published in
2007, Vol. 2(3) eucrim pp 133 – 138
ISSN: 1862-6947
https://eucrim.eu

CC BY ND

I. Introduction

The following article will first give an overview of the legislative implementation of the European Arrest Warrant in Slovenia (II.). Despite the fact that the first Slovenian law implementing the EU Framework Decision on the European arrest warrant had been adopted in April 2004, a new Act was recently adopted in October 2007. It introduced only slight changes but regrettably did not use the opportunity to fully align with the Framework Decision (in particular as regards the institution of a central authority that would most likely improve the effectiveness of the EAW procedure). Furthermore, this article will go into the proceedings before the Constitutional Court which raised the question of the constitutionality of the Slovenian law on the European Arrest Warrant; however, the Constitutional Court unfortunately did not decide on the merits of this legal instrument (III.). Ultimately, the author will also relate some of the experiences of Slovenian judges collected through interviews conducted with them (IV.).

During the Slovenian accession process, the first step taken towards the implementation of the Council's Framework Decision 2002/585/JHA of 13 June 2002 on the European arrest warrant and the surrender procedures between Member States (hereinafter: FD EAW) was the amendment of the Constitution of the Republic of Slovenia (hereinafter: CRS) in 2003.[1] With the newly introduced Article 3a CRS, Slovenia partly transferred a part of its sovereignty to the EU, providing *inter alia* for the following: "Legal acts and decisions adopted within international organizations to which Slovenia has transferred the exercise of part of its sovereign rights shall be applied in Slovenia in accordance with the legal regulation of these organizations."[2] Next, Art. 47 of the Constitution was amended since it previously explicitly forbade the extradition of Slovenian nationals to foreign countries. The newly adopted Art. 47 CRS[3] now provides for extradition as follows: "No citizen of Slovenia may be extradited or surrendered unless such obligation to extradite or surrender arises from a treaty by which, in accordance with the provisions of the first paragraph of Art. 3a, Slovenia has transferred the exercise of part of its sovereign rights to an international organization".[4]

An extensive debate had been held on the question of whether Slovenia should implement the Framework Decision on the European arrest warrant in the form of a special statute or as an amendment of the Code of Criminal Procedure (hereinafter: CCP) since Slovenian national law already contained provisions on extradition in the CCP. The legislator decided on the first option and passed a special act. Therefore, Slovenia implemented the FD EAW by adopting the Act on the European Arrest Warrant and Surrender Procedures (hereinafter: AEAW) which came into force on the day of Slovenia's accession to the EU (1 May 2004).[5] The rules on the form of the European arrest and surrender warrant were published in May 2007.[6]

However, this legislation did not last long. On 26 October 2007, the National Assembly adopted the Act on International Co-operation in Criminal Matters between the Member States of the European Union (hereinafter: AICCM),[7] regulating cooperation under international law in criminal matters with EU Member States and replacing the provisions of the Act on the European Arrest Warrant and Surrender Procedures and the rules on the form of the European arrest and surrender warrant of 2004. The AICCM was adopted with the purpose of regulating the substance of cooperation in criminal matters between the Member States (MS) wholly, transparently, and efficiently in one single act. It also changed some solutions adopted by the AEAW. Besides the EAW, the AICCM also implemented some additional EU Framework Decisions in the criminal law field.[8]

https://doi.org/10.30709/eucrim-2007-010

II. Legislative Implementation of the EAW in Slovenia

In the general part, the AICCM emphasizes four general principles which guide the implementation of the EAW in Slovenian law (Articles 3-6 AICCM):

- the principle of mutual recognition,
- the principle of speciality,
- the principle of aid effectiveness,[9] and
- the principle of accelerated proceedings.

The AICCM does not apply in cases where cooperation in criminal matters is regulated differently by another EU act entailing direct effect or by other international agreements between the MS. The Act also provides for the subsidiary use of the Code of Criminal Procedure (CCP) or other national criminal law legislation. The CCP's provisions on extradition remain in force since they have to be applied in cases of extradition in relation to third states.

1. Scope of the EAW in Slovenia

The second part of the Act is entirely dedicated to procedures of the European Arrest Warrant (Articles. 8-46 AICCM). By defining for which criminal offences it is possible to execute the surrender of a requested person, the AICCM mostly follows the FD EAW.

The surrender can be granted or issued (on the proposal of the state prosecutor or by a competent judge)[10] for criminal offences (1) prosecutable in the issuing state *ex officio,* punishable with a custodial sentence of at least 12 months or (2) for the execution of the custodial sentence or other security or similar measure executable in connection with the custodial sentence of imprisonment of at least 4 months. In both cases, the act has to be punishable according to Slovenian law as well (double criminality – Articles 8(1) and 40 AICCM). In the case of any the 32 categories of criminal offences for which the double criminality check has been abolished, the Slovenian legislator strictly followed the provisions of the FD (Articles 2(2) FD EAW, 8(2) AICCM).

We can see that the Slovenian legislator strictly followed the provisions of the FD when providing for the conditions for execution of the EAW regarding criminal offences for which the double criminality check has been abolished, but somewhat altering the scope of criminal offences for which the double criminality check is still in power. The FD EAW does not mention "*ex officio* prosecutable" criminal offences, but merely defines them by the severity of punishment. The Slovenian legislator, however, limited to a slight extent the scope of criminal offences for which Slovenia will execute the EAW, namely to those prosecutable *ex officio*.

It is probably interesting to know that the Slovenian law distinguishes between different types of prosecution: (1) for the great majority of the offences, the competent prosecutor is the state prosecutor; (2) for certain criminal offences (the ones with a personal element, e.g. slander), the substantive criminal law explicitly provides for private-law prosecution, or (3) criminal prosecution on the basis of a motion of the victim. In case criminal prosecution is based on a motion, it is up to the victim to file a motion for the prosecution to begin, but from then on the competent prosecutor is the public prosecutor. It is not clear why the Slovenian legislator introduced the "ex officio" criteria as one of the conditions for the EAWs to be issued or executed, but we can presume that the purpose was to try to avoid surrender for minor criminal offences, the prosecution of which was not entrusted to the professional judgment of the public prosecutor. One cannot yet as-

sess the consequences of this limitation since we do not yet have data on how this prosecution is organized in all 27 MS.

2. Formalities for the Execution of EAWs

It is required that the issuing state must translate the EAW into either Slovenian or English. If the requested person is already in pre-trial detention, then the Slovenian judge can order that the EAW is to be translated into Slovenian in order to speed up proceedings (Art. 15 AICCM). The judicial authority competent in the execution of the EAW is an investigating judge from the district court responsible for the area in which the requested person resides or is located (Art. 13 AICCM). In cases where the requested person consents to being surrendered, it is the investigating judge who makes the decision (Art. 21(1) AICCM). In cases where the requested person does not consent to the surrender, a panel of three district court judges makes the decision to permit or refuse the surrender after it receives a reasoned proposal from the investigating judge (Art. 22(4) AICCM).

Upon receiving the EAW, the competent investigating judge must first formally check the EAW to establish whether the EAW contains all the required information (Art. 17(1) AICCM implementing Art. 8(1) FD EAW). If all the requirements are met, the investigating judge must schedule the hearing and no other check is provided for. The newly adopted AICCM changed the provisions of the AEAW in one respect in that it is now obligatory for the investigating judge to issue an arrest warrant for the requested person. Before the change of legislation, the arrest of the requested person was not obligatory. It was up to the investigating judge to decide whether the requested person has to be arrested or whether it is sufficient to summon him/her only to the hearing. Unfortunately, the legislator did not provide the reasoning for implementing such a change.

3. The Surrender Procedure

Upon arresting the requested person, the police must advise him/her that the arrest is pursuant to an EAW and inform him/her of the country that is requesting the surrender and why it is doing so. The arrested person must be advised immediately that he/she is not obliged to make a statement, that he/she has a right to the immediate legal assistance of an attorney freely chosen, and the competent authority is obliged, if so requested, to inform his/her next of kin of the detention. If the requested person is not a Slovenian citizen, he/she must also be advised that the competent authority is obliged, if so requested, to inform his country's consulate of his/her detention (Art. 18(1) AICCM). As soon as possible, within 48 hours at most, the person must be brought before the investigating judge for a hearing. When the person is brought in, the investigating judge must once again inform him/her of his/her rights, then inform the person of the meaning of the principle of speciality and the possibility to consent to surrender. Then, the requested person is questioned as to the possible existence of grounds for non-execution (Art. 19(2) AICCM). If reasons for suspicion exist that the requested person might flee, the investigating judge can order pre-trial detention according to the rules of the national CCP (Art. 23(2) AICCM).

The procedure on executing the EAW cannot continue without the requested person being present. At the hearing following the arrest of the requested person, the presence of the state prosecutor is obligatory (Art. 19(2) AICCM). The requested person must have a legal counsel for the entire duration of the surrender procedure – from the time he/she is brought before the investigating judge, or from the first hearing to decide on the surrender, to the surrender itself. If the requested person does not engage a legal counsel, the president of the competent court appoints one *ex officio* (Art. 16(1) AICCM).

According to the provisions of the AICCM, the requested person specifically has the right to request the warrant to be translated into his/her native language or into another language he/she understands (Art. 16(2)

AICCM). The requested person also has the right to request an interpreter according to the CCP provisions. All surrender decisions must be treated as a matter of urgency; in this respect, the Slovenian implementation law directly follows the time limits of the FD EAW.[11]

4. Grounds for Refusal

The Slovenian law distinguishes between mandatory and optional grounds for refusal of the surrender of a person. Specifically, these grounds are laid out in the following. The surrender of a requested person *must* be refused in all of the cases provided for by the FD EAW:

(1) if a warrant has been issued for a criminal offence covered by an amnesty in the Republic of Slovenia, under the condition that a domestic court is competent to prosecute (Art. 9(1) AICCM);

(2) if the warrant has been issued for a criminal offence for which the requested person has already been finally acquitted or convicted in Slovenia, in another Member State, or in a third country, on condition that, in the event that a sentence was passed, the sentence has been served or is being served, or that, according to the legislation of the country in which the sentence was passed, the sentence can no longer be executed (principle of ne bis in idem – Art. 9(2) AICCM);

(3) if a warrant has been issued for a criminal offence for which criminal proceedings against the requested person in Slovenia were conclusively terminated or the charge finally rejected, or if the competent state prosecutor rejected the criminal charge because the suspect met the agreed conditions in the settlement procedure or fulfilled the tasks imposed to lessen or rectify the damaging consequences of the criminal offence in accordance with the instructions of the state prosecutor and the provisions of the act regulating the criminal procedure (Art. 9(3) AICCM);

(4) if the warrant has been issued for a criminal offence committed by a requested person who is under the Slovenian domestic age limit for criminal responsibility (Art. 9(4) AICCM), that is, 14 years of age (Art. 71 Criminal Code);[12]

(5) if the warrant has been issued for a criminal offence for which prosecution or the execution of a sentence have become statute-barred, under the condition that a domestic court is competent to prosecute or execute the sentence (Art. 9(5) AICCM);

(6) if the warrant has been issued for a criminal offence that is not punishable in domestic criminal legislation and the exceptions from the second paragraph of Art. 2 of the FD may not be applied (double criminality principle – Art. 9(6) AICCM);

(7) if criminal proceedings are taking place against a requested person in Slovenia for the same criminal offence for which the warrant was issued, if this criminal offence was committed against the Republic of Slovenia, or if the criminal offence was committed against a Slovenian citizen, and no financial guarantee has been provided to enforce the victim's indemnification claim (Art. 9(7) AICCM);

(8) if there are reasonable grounds for concluding that the warrant was issued for the purpose of instigating criminal prosecution against and sentencing the requested person on the basis of his/her sex, race, faith, ethnic origin, nationality, language, political conviction, or sexual orientation, or if his/her chance of a fair trial would be significantly impaired for any of these reasons (Art. 9(8) AICCM);[13] and

(9) if the issuing judicial authority has not given certain assurances, defined in Art. 5 FD EAW and Art. 11 AICCM (Art. 9(9) AICCM).

Art. 10 AICCM provides grounds for optional non-execution. The surrender of a requested person *may* be refused for the following reasons:

(1) if criminal proceedings are taking place against the requested person in the Republic of Slovenia for the same criminal offence for which the warrant was issued and if it would clearly be easier for criminal proceedings to be held in Slovenia (Art. 10(1) AICCM);

2) if a request for investigation has been rejected in the Republic of Slovenia in a final decision taken to this effect because no reasonable grounds were adduced to support the suspicion that the requested person committed the criminal offence for which the warrant was issued (Art. 10(2) AICCM);

(3) if the warrant has been issued for the execution of a custodial sentence and the requested person is a citizen of the Republic of Slovenia or a Member State residing in the territory of the Republic of Slovenia, or a foreign person with a permit for permanent residence in Slovenia, if the requested person so wishes and provided that the domestic court agrees to execute the judgement of the court of the issuing Member State in accordance with domestic law (Art. 10(3) AICCM);

(4) if the EAW has been issued for criminal offences that, according to domestic criminal law, are dealt with as if they had been committed outside the territory of the Republic of Slovenia (Art. 10(4) AICCM) or if the EAW has been issued for criminal offences committed outside the territory of the issuing Member State but domestic criminal law does not permit prosecution for the same offence when committed outside the territory of the Republic of Slovenia (Art. 10(5) AICCM).

Ultimately, Slovenian law provides for the possibility to postpone surrender as an exception for serious humanitarian reasons, in particular if it is likely that surrender would clearly seriously threaten the life or health of the requested person (Art. 34(3) AICCM).

A closer analysis reveals that the Slovenian legislator decided to organize the grounds for mandatory and optional non-execution in a manner different to that of the FD EAW. The Slovenian legislation first introduces some more mandatory grounds for the non-execution other than those provided by the FD EAW: e.g., ground for a mandatory non-execution of the EAW on the basis of discrimination which is not provided for by the FD EAW (Art. 9(8) AICCM). Secondly, it makes some optional grounds provided for in the FD EAW mandatory: e.g., Art. 4(4) FD EAW (where the criminal prosecution or punishment of the requested person is statute-barred according to the law of the executing Member State and the acts fall within the jurisdiction of that Member State under its own criminal law) became a mandatory ground for the non-execution (Art. 9(5) AICCM). And thirdly, Slovenian law sometimes splits the grounds for optional non-execution into two parts; one part is covered by a mandatory ground and the other by an optional ground for the non-execution: e.g., optional ground from Art. 4(2) FD EAW (where the person who is the subject of the European Arrest Warrant is being prosecuted in the executing Member State for the same act as that on which the European Arrest Warrant is based) has been split into two parts: a mandatory ground is covered by Art. 9(7) AICCM (if criminal proceedings are taking place against a requested person in Slovenia for the same criminal offence for which the warrant was issued) and an optional ground by Art. 10(1) AICCM (if criminal proceedings are taking place against the requested person in the Republic of Slovenia for the same criminal offence for which the warrant was issued and if it would clearly be easier for criminal proceedings to be held in Slovenia).[14]

III. Constitutional Court Case

Until now, one interesting case regarding the EAW has been brought to the Constitutional Court of the Republic of Slovenia.[15] The applicant (the requested person and his attorney) claimed that the former law implementing the FD EAW, namely the AEAW, was not in line with the Slovenian Constitution. The applicant

claimed that the then valid AEAW was unconstitutional because it breached Articles 23, 25 and 29 of the Constitution of the Republic of Slovenia. Art. 23 CRS guarantees the right to judicial protection.[16] The applicant claimed that, according to the well-established constitutional doctrine, the right to judicial protection has to be effective and not merely formal. In the case of the EAW, this would mean that the judicial protection can only be effective if the court can perform an in-depth reflection on the merits and not only a formal check.[17] The right to judicial protection was therefore breached by the fact that the procedure of deciding on the European Arrest Warrant allows only for a formal check and the court is not allowed to check the legal basis or the evidence of the case. The same logic applies to the right deriving from Art. 25 CRS – the right to legal remedies. The right to legal remedy has to be effective, which means that the appellate court must be able to decide on the merits of the case and not only make a formal check. Art. 29 CRS contains legal guarantees in criminal proceedings.[18] Since there can be no doubt that, in the case of an EAW, the concept of a 'criminal charge' can be applied, the rights guaranteed in Art. 29 CRS should also apply to the EAW procedures. The applicant claimed that the right of Art. 29(4) CRS had been breached – namely the right to produce evidence to his benefit – since the court deciding on the EAW did not asses the evidence or the probability that the criminal offence in question was committed.

It would have been very interesting to see how the Constitutional Court would have answered all these assertions but, unfortunately, the application[19] was rejected by the Constitutional Court since the requested person had already been surrendered to the issuing Member State. Art. 24 of the Constitutional Court Act namely provides that only a person holding a so-called 'legal interest' may file a request.[20] Since the applicant had already been surrendered, the Constitutional Court held that he no longer had a legal interest in the case and therefore rejected the request as inadmissible. The decision was criticized in the academic journals.[21] The commentators claimed that the Constitutional Court did not show enough courage in tackling the question of the jurisdiction of the Slovenian constitution within the legal framework of the European Union.[22]

IV. Final Remarks

It is unusual that the new legislation on the EAW was introduced so soon after the initial implementing law had been adopted (see I.). Although the new law repeats or only slightly changes the provisions of the old law, the legislator unfortunately did not seize the opportunity to improve some solutions, the most notorious being the problem with the central authority (according to Art. 7(2) FD EAW): Slovenian law still does not provide for it. However, the notification to the Council designates[23] the Ministry of Justice as being competent to act as the central authority to assist the competent judicial authorities if difficulties arise in transmitting the arrest warrant. At present, it is only SIRENE[24] (managed by the Slovenian Interpol Unit) which performs, at least in part, the role of a central authority. It maintains the register of EAWs, but only when the whereabouts of the requested persons are unknown; otherwise they are sent directly to a competent judicial authority. When a request is executed (the person is surrendered), the EAW is also entered into the SIRENE system. Therefore, if a certain judicial authority wants to know whether there was a warrant issued for a certain person, there is no Slovenian authority which can provide the relevant information in cases in which the whereabouts of the person are known and the EAW proceedings are in progress. There is also no central registration of outgoing EAWs. Judicial authorities as well as the police are also lacking an authority to provide advice or expertise in this matter.

The exact number of executed EAWs issued by Slovenian authorities is therefore not available, due to the continuing lack of a central authority for the proceedings within the Slovenian system. However, the Slovenian Ministry of Justice has mandated the Institute of Criminology at the Faculty of Law of the University of Ljubljana to conduct a study of all the EAW files that Slovenia has either issued or executed. A more detailed analysis will thus be available at the end of 2008. The researchers have also conducted interviews with the

investigating judges and established that the judiciary in Slovenia is generally quite satisfied with the way surrender procedures function. The judges consider the procedures to be much quicker and more efficient in comparison to those required for formal extradition. Most judges remark that the judge-to-judge communication, unfortunately, still does not work since most countries still communicate with them through the central authority or even through Interpol, despite the fact that the foreign court is sometimes only few kilometres across the border. Such proceedings prolong the surrender unnecessarily, sometimes even for months.

Some judges also complained about how the scope of checking the legal context of the EAW differs from state to state. Slovenian investigating judges find it very frustrating that they cannot check whether the offence can reasonably be subsumed under one of the 32 listed offences for which the double criminality check has been dropped, even in cases where the description is very vague and the category is broad. However, there have been cases in which Slovenia was an issuing state for one of the listed offences, such as fraud, and the executing judicial authority of another EU Member State *did* in fact request information from our judicial authority regarding the factual side of the offence, hence questioning the application of the legal norm. This is one example which shows that some states thus obviously still check the factual and legal context, even regarding one of the mentioned 32 offences, and assume they have the right to do so. There is still a lot to be learned about the empirical side of how the principle of mutual recognition works.

---

1. Official Journal of the Republic of Slovenia (hereinafter: O. J.) No. 24/03 from 7 March 2003.↩
2. For the complete text see: http://www.us-rs.si/en/index.php?sv_path=6).↩
3. Constitutional Act Amending the First Chapter and Articles 47 and 68 of the Constitution of the Republic of Slovenia, O. J. 24-899/2003.↩
4. *C. Ribičič*, Položaj slovenske ustave po vključitvi v EU (The Position of the Slovenian Constitution after joining the EU). Pravna praksa, V. 25, no. 29-30, 2006, pp. II-VI.↩
5. O.J. No. 37/04 of 15 April 2004.↩
6. O. J. No. 51/04 of 7 May 2004.↩
7. O. J. No. 102/07 of 9 November 2007.↩
8. The AICCM has also implemented the FD of 13 June 2002 on joint investigation teams (2002/465/JHA); the Council Decision of 28 February 2002 setting up Eurojust with a view to reinforcing the fight against serious crime (2002/187/JHA); the Joint Action of 29 June 1998 adopted by the Council on the basis of Art. K.3 of the Treaty on European Union on the creation of a European Judicial Network (98/428/JHA); the FD of 24 February 2005 on the application of the principle of mutual recognition to financial penalties (2005/214/JHA); the FD of 22 July 2003 on the execution in the EU of orders freezing property and evidence (2003/577/JHA); the FD of 24 February 2005 on confiscation of crime-related proceeds, instrumentalities and property (2005/212/JHA); the FD of 6 October on the application of the principle of mutual recognition to confiscation orders (2006/783/JHA); the Council Decision of 21 November 2005 on the exchange of information extracted from the criminal records.↩
9. Art. 5 AICCM provides that the competent authorities of the Republic of Slovenia are obliged within the legal limits of their powers to act in such a way that most accomplishes the goal of cooperating with other MS to the greatest possible extent.↩
10. The competent authorities for issuing an EAW are state prosecutors or district courts which can issue it *ex officio* as soon as the conditions mentioned above are met (Art. 40 AICCM).↩
11. See Art. 17 FD EAW.↩
12. This ground will certainly prove to be an obstacle to surrender since the age limit for criminal responsibility is substantially lower in some of the Member States than in others.↩
13. *S. Alegre/M. Leaf*, European Arrest Warrant: A solution ahead of its time?, *Justice*, London, 2003, pp. 29-31.↩
14. For more detailed analysis, see K. Šugman, Slovenian national report on the implementation of the EAW on: http://www.eurowarrant.net/ (5.1.2008)↩
15. U-I-14/06, from 22. 6. 2006. There was one more case (Up-261/06 from 11.4.2006) brought to the Constitutional Court but was not even admitted to the procedure since the applicant did not use the right legal remedy.↩
16. Art. 23(1) CRS: "Everyone has the right to have any decision regarding his rights, duties and any charges brought against him made without undue delay by an independent, impartial court constituted by law."↩
17. Both the FD EAW and and the AEAW provide only for the duty of the judge to check the EAW formally: whether the EAW contains all the required information (Art. 16(1) AEAW implementing Art. 8(1) FWD). If all the conditions are met the investigating judge must schedule the hearing and no other check is provided for. Therefore, the judge, cannot and must not check the evidential base of the EAW nor he/she can asses the question whether the acts for which the EAW was issued can reasonably be qualified as one of the 32 categories enumerated in Art. 2(2) FD EAW.↩
18. Art. 29 CRS (Legal Guarantees in Criminal Proceedings: (1) Anyone charged with a criminal offence must, in addition to absolute equality, be guaranteed the following rights: (2) the right to have adequate time and facilities to prepare his defence; (3) the right to be present at his trial and to conduct his own defence or to be defended by a legal representative; (4) the right to present all evidence to his benefit; (5) the right not to incriminate himself or his relatives or those close to him, or to admit guilt.↩
19. The legal remedy is called "Request for assessment of the constitutionality and legality of a law".↩
20. Art. 24 Constitutional Court Act: (1) Anyone who demonstrates legal interest may lodge a petition that the procedure for the review of the constitutionality or legality of regulations or general acts issued for the exercise of public authority be initiated.

(2) Legal interest is deemed to be demonstrated if a regulation or general act issued for the exercise of public authority whose review has been requested by the petitioner directly interferes with his rights, legal interests, or legal position.↩

21. *B. Kovačič Mlinar*, Je ZENPP v neskladju z Ustavo? ("Is the AEAW in accordance with the Constitution?"), Pravna praksa, 25, no. 14, 2006, pp. 13-14.↩
22. *B. Kovačič Mlinar*, Pomanjkanje poguma pri odločitvi o pobudi za oceno ustavnosti ZENPP ("Lack of courage while deciding on the Request for assessment of the constitutionality of the AEAW"), Pravna praksa, 25, no. 37, 2006, p. 15; *A. Erbežnik*, Ustavno sodišče RS ter ENPP ("Constitutional Court of the Republic of Slovenia and EAW"), Pravna praksa, 27, no. 1, 2008, pp. 22-24.↩
23. Slovenian notification concerning the EAW http://www.eurowarrant.net/documents/cms_eaw_2_1_EJN537.pdf (20. 10. 2005)↩
24. The Schengen information system (SIS) was set up to allow police forces from the Schengen countries to access data on certain individuals (e. g. suspects wanted for arrest or extradition, missing persons etc.) and on goods which have been lost or stolen. The SIS is supplemented by a network known as SIRENE (Supplementary Information Request at the National Entry). It allows communication between the SIRENE offices in every Schengen State. The SIRENE offices serve as the intermediaries between the national authorities responsible for the data on the SIS (judges, police).↩

COPYRIGHT/DISCLAIMER
© The Author(s). Published by the Max Planck Institute for the Study of Crime, Security and Law. This is an open access article published under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NoDerivatives 4.0 International (CC BY-ND 4.0) licence. This permits users to share (copy and redistribute) the material in any medium or format for any purpose, even commercially, provided that appropriate credit is given, a link to the license is provided, and changes are indicated. If users remix, transform, or build upon the material, they may not distribute the modified material. For details, see https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nd/4.0/.
Views and opinions expressed in the material contained in eucrim are those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the editors, the editorial board, the publisher, the European Union, the European Commission, or other contributors. Sole responsibility lies with the author of the contribution. The publisher and the European Commission are not responsible for any use that may be made of the information contained therein.

About eucrim

eucrim is the leading journal serving as a European forum for insight and debate on criminal and "criministrative" law. For over 20 years, it has brought together practitioners, academics, and policymakers to exchange ideas and shape the future of European justice. From its inception, eucrim has placed focus on the protection of the EU's financial interests – a key driver of European integration in "criministrative" justice policy.
Editorially reviewed articles published in English, French, or German, are complemented by timely news and analysis of legal and policy developments across Europe.
All content is freely accessible at https://eucrim.eu, with four online and print issues published annually.

Stay informed by emailing to eucrim-subscribe@csl.mpg.de to receive alerts for new releases.
The project is co-financed by the Union Anti-Fraud Programme (UAFP), managed by the European Anti-Fraud Office (OLAF).

Co-funded by the European Union