



**COUNCIL OF
THE EUROPEAN UNION**

Brussels, 16 November 2013

**Interinstitutional File:
2013/0255 (APP)**

**16030/1/13
REV 1**

**EPPO 20
EUROJUST 114
CATS 77
FIN 735
COPEN 191
INST 597
PARLNAT 273**

OPINION

from: The Czech Senate

date of receipt: 14 October 2013

to: Council

Subject: Proposal for a Council Regulation on the establishment of the European Public Prosecutor's Office
Doc. 12558/13 EPPO 3 EUROJUST 58 CATS 35 FIN 467 COPEN 108
[COM(2013) 534 final]

- Opinion¹ on the application of the Principles of Subsidiarity and Proportionality

Delegations will find attached the above mentioned Opinion.

Encl.

¹ This opinion is available in English on the interparliamentary EU information exchange site (IPEX) at the following address: <http://www.ipex.eu/IPEXL-WEB/search.do>



**THE SENATE
OF THE PARLIAMENT OF THE CZECH REPUBLIC
9TH TERM**

RESOLUTION OF THE SENATE

345th RESOLUTION

delivered on the 14th meeting held on 9th October 2013

on the Proposal for a Council Regulation on the establishment of the European Public Prosecutor's Office (Senate Press no. N 082/09)

The Senate

I.

1. Has come to the conclusion

that the draft regulation does not comply with the principle of subsidiarity, as stipulated in Article 5(3) of the Treaty on European Union, because the Commission has substantiated neither the necessity of an action at EU level in the form of establishment of the European Public Prosecutor's Office, nor the actual added value of its establishment, especially considering the problems that would be connected with its establishment and functioning;

2. Adopts,

in accordance with Article 6 of the Protocol on the Application of the Principles of Subsidiarity and Proportionality attached to the Treaties, a **reasoned opinion** on the incompatibility of the draft regulation with the principle of subsidiarity, on the grounds set out in Points II.1 to II.5 of this resolution;

II.

1. Does not agree

with the Commission's assertion that the prosecution of criminal offences against the financial interests of the Union is insufficient and fragmentary in the member states, which is used as an argument supporting the establishment of the Office, because the Senate is of the opinion that this assertion may, in general, be related to any area of criminal activities and that the establishment of the Office cannot resolve the causes of the described situation:

- the differences between the member states are caused mainly by their different laws and also generally by the functioning of their judicial and administrative systems, including the economic and administrative conditions; this cannot be eliminated by the regulation;
- the effectiveness of prosecution of criminal offences against the financial interests of the Union is influenced, first and foremost, by the general difficulties with uncovering various types of financial criminality, which, however, do not relate specifically and solely to the treatment of financial means flowing from or into the EU budget;

2. Questions

the actual added value of the establishment of the Office, especially with regard to the following:

- the Office will be fully dependent on the existing sources of information and the effectiveness of its activities will continue to be conditioned by the effective operation of the member state authorities;
- although the regulation strives to respect the member states' laws to the greatest possible extent, its application will complicate and protract the criminal proceedings, e.g. by the necessity to submit questions for preliminary ruling on the interpretation of the regulation to the Court of Justice or the necessity to draw up translations for the purpose of direction and decision-making of the central European Public Prosecutor;
- the legal ambiguities regarding the functioning of the Office may lead to a higher number of procedural errors that may prevent the punishment of the culprits;
- the increased effectiveness of prosecution may eventually follow from the lowering of procedural standards (e.g. the duty to admit evidence even if it has not been collected in accordance with the national law of the member state where the court conducting the proceeding is located);

3. Admits

that in case of a prosecution taking place in more than one member state, the cooperation of European Delegated Prosecutors from the respective member states as parts of one office may be more effective and swifter than the existing instruments; however, the Commission proposes to establish a competence of the Office also for criminal offences related to a sole member state and does not provide the information on how frequent the prosecution of criminal offences against the financial interests of the Union in more than one member state actually is;

4. Considers

the strengthening and deepening of existing mechanisms of cross-border cooperation of criminal justice authorities of the member states to be a more effective instrument for the protection of financial interests of the Union, because these mechanisms, some of which have been established only recently, may be used more effectively; this may be facilitated, among other things, by strengthening their administrative capacities and broadening of the information and analytical support provided to the member states' authorities;

5. Finds,

therefore, the draft regulation premature; in this respect, the Senate draws attention to the fact that the last reform of Eurojust has not yet been fully implemented and evaluated and, consequently, the conclusion that it is insufficient cannot be drawn;

6. Points out

that the regulation may violate the level of protection of fundamental rights guaranteed by the constitutional order of the Czech Republic and by the Convention on the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms (which may, as a result, constitute a violation of the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union), especially regarding the right to a lawful judge, which may be touched upon by the broad discretion of the European prosecutor in the choice of the competent national court, and the right to a fair trial, which may be touched upon by the single-instance decision-making of the Office, the absence of appellate procedures against decisions regulated in detail in the proposal, as well as the absence of any procedure for adjudication on the objection of prejudice of the European prosecutor, with the exception of judicial review;

7. Therefore calls upon

the Commission to carry out a more detailed analysis of the impacts of the regulation upon the constitutional law of individual member states and revise the proposal accordingly;

8. Considers advisable

that, when carrying out the detailed analysis, the possible establishment of the Office and its form should be thoroughly debated with the utmost regard to the member states' remarks stemming from their experience in the area of justice in criminal matters;

9. Recommends,

in order to minimise uncertainties regarding the applicability of national penal laws, that the questions of linking of the substantive provisions of the regulation with the national law should be either addressed in the regulation itself, or expressly left upon the member states;

10. Demands

that the Office act vis-à-vis third countries only via member states authorities;

11. Remarks

that the regulation of protection of personal data processed by the Office must be in accord with the ongoing reform of personal data protection at the Union level;

III.

1. Requests

the Government to inform the Senate about the way this position was taken into account, and about further development of negotiations;

2. Authorises

the President of the Senate to forward this reasoned opinion to the presidents of the European Commission, the European Parliament and the Council.

Milan Štěch
sign manual
President of the Senate

Radko Martínek
sign manual
Senate Verifier
