

Please cite as: EUAA, '[4.8.5. The interplay between the use of detention and the steps of the asylum procedure](#)' in *Asylum Report 2022*, May 2022.

## 4.8.5. The interplay between the use of detention and the steps of the asylum procedure

### 4.8.5. The interplay between the use of detention and the steps of the asylum procedure



Detention may have implications on the asylum procedure in terms of access to procedure, information provision, the personal interview and applicable timeframes. In 2021, EU+ countries made efforts to counterbalance shortcomings and address existing gaps.

The Finnish Immigration Service started conducting personal interviews through videoconferencing more often in detention units.<sup>[857](#)</sup> Cyprus developed the Guide of Prisoner's First Contact to inform newly-arrived detainees about their rights, obligations and the applicable rules.<sup>[858](#)</sup>

In a [case](#) involving the Netherlands, the ECtHR concluded that the ECHR, Article 5(4) had not been violated when, during the first weeks of the COVID-19 pandemic, the applicant was represented by and heard through his lawyer, who had attended the hearing on a detention order by telephone and with whom he had had regular contact. The general interest of public health and the application's fundamental rights had been respected, even if the applicant could not attend in person or through videoconference.

Following the Supreme Court of Cassation's [ruling](#) on administrative shortcomings in Italy, if the territorial commission failed to summon the applicant within the timeframe for an accelerated procedure, detention measures should be revoked since the detention period cannot exceed the time needed to examine the application. Nonetheless, practical barriers in accessing the asylum procedure were noted in Italy for detainees in a pre-removal detention centre (CPR).<sup>[859](#)</sup>

