

4.2.2. Continuing to ensure applicants' rights and obligations at second or higher instances

4.2.2. Continuing to ensure applicants' rights and obligations at second or higher instances



Changes to legislation and practices aimed to strengthen procedural safeguards for children in appeal procedures. For example, a legislative amendment in Norway lowered the threshold for conducting hearings by the Immigration Appeals Board (UNE) in deportation cases involving children.[205](#) Belgium introduced summons letters that explain the course of a hearing in a child-friendly manner, as recommended by the guidelines of the Council of Europe. A pilot project at the Belgian CALL tailored a courtroom to encourage interaction between a minor and the judge.[206](#)

To improve the quality of judicial processes, several courts provided continuous professional development for judges, often with the support of the EUAA.[207](#) In Ireland, the High Court clarified the duties of the first level of appeal, IPAT. It ruled in January 2024 that IPAT had at a minimum the duty to analyse the COI presented by the applicant and if the tribunal's position was to reject the COI or use other COI, the tribunal needs to provide an explanation for its reasoning.[208](#) The ECtHR ruled in a case against Poland that an appeal against a refusal of entry and a further appeal to the domestic administrative courts were not effective remedies within the meaning of the Convention because they did not have an automatic suspensive effect.[209](#)

Civil society organisations reported on some gaps in the appeals procedure that may undermine applicants' rights. For example, Asylex and the Swiss Refugee Council noted that the absence of an oral hearing before the second instance body in Switzerland continued to be a significant hindrance, as the appeal is exclusively conducted in writing, and only in rare cases a hearing is organised to clarify the facts.[210](#) In addition, Asylex noted a systematic reduction of access to legal assistance before the Federal Administrative Court.[211](#) The Refugee Council identified different obstacles to an effective appeal procedure, including the fact that the court may request, if the appeal is prima facie without merit, an advance payment of about CHF 750 for presumed costs of the appeal proceedings, under penalty of the inadmissibility of the appeal. Unaccompanied minors are exempt from the payment.[212](#)

In recent years, issues have arisen over applicants' right to know and access classified information.²¹³ It was welcomed that in Malta a legal notice introduced the possibility for the International Protection Appeals Tribunal to access information in the applicant's file relating to national security.²¹⁴ The Dutch district court in Roermond referred to the CJEU for a preliminary ruling to clarify what information is included in the concept of 'information in the applicant's file upon the basis of which a decision is or will be made' within the meaning of the recast APD, Article 23(1) and whether this also includes access to information on the manner in which that information was gathered and obtained.²¹⁵

The extent of a judicial review in the context of the recast APD, Article 46(1) and (3) read in the light of the EU Charter of Fundamental Rights, Article 47 and the meaning of the full and *ex nunc* examination of an application for international protection continued to give rise to referrals for preliminary rulings. The CJEU delivered a judgment on this matter in October 2024²¹⁶ and April 2025.²¹⁷ The Dutch district court in Zwolle referred to the CJEU for a preliminary ruling on whether the court can make its own assessment of the credibility of an asylum claim, replacing the assessment made by the determining authority.²¹⁸

205

Government | Regjeringen. (2024, May 24). [Flere utvisningssaker som berører barn skal behandles i nemndmøte, \[Several deportation cases affecting children must be dealt with in a tribunal meeting\]](#). Immigration Appeals Board | Utlendingsnemnda. (2024, June 5). [Forskriftsendring gir lågare terskel for nemndmøte, \[Amendment to the regulations provides a lower threshold for a tribunal meeting\]](#).

206

<https://www.rvv-cce.be/nl/actua/aangepaste-oproepingsbrieven-en-een-zittingszaal-op-maat-van-minderjarigen>

207

<https://euaa.europa.eu/asylum-knowledge/courts-and-tribunals>

208

Ireland, High Court, [M.B. v International Protection Appeals Tribunal & Anor](#), [2024] IEHC 12, 12 January 2024. Link redirects to the English summary in the EUAA Case Law Database.

209

Council of Europe, European Court of Human Rights [ECtHR], [Sherov and Others v Poland](#), No 54029/17, 54117/17, 54128/17 and others, ECLI:CE:ECHR:2024:0404JUD005402917, 4 April 2024. Link redirects to the English summary in the EUAA Case Law Database.

210

Asylex. (2024). [Input to the Asylum Report 2025](#). Swiss Refugee Council | Schweizerische Flüchtlingshilfe | Organisation suisse d'aide aux réfugiés. (2024). [Input to the Asylum Report 2025](#)

[211](#)

Asylex. (2024). [Input to the Asylum Report 2025](#)

[212](#)

Swiss Refugee Council | Schweizerische Flüchtlingshilfe | Organisation suisse d'aide aux réfugiés. (2024). [Input to the Asylum Report 2025](#).

[213](#)

Hungarian Helsinki Committee. [The Right to Know in the European Union: Comparative Study on Access to Classified Data in National Security Related Immigration Cases](#). 16 April 2024. Lithuanian Red Cross Society | Lietuvos Raudonojo Kryžiaus. (2024). [Input to the Asylum Report 2025](#).

[214](#)

Legislation Malta | Le?islazzjoni Malta, [104 tal-2024 - Regolamenti tal-2024 li jemendaw ir-Regolamenti dwar l-Istandards ta' Pro?edura g?all-G?oti u l-Irtirar tal-Protezzjoni Internazzjonali Gazzetta tal-Gvern ta' Malta Nru. 21,233– 26.04.2024 \[104 of 2024 - Regulations of 2024 amending the Regulations on Procedural Standards for Granting and Withdrawing International Protection Government Gazette of Malta No 21,233 – 26.04.2024\]](#) , 26 April 2024.

[215](#)

Netherlands, Court of The Hague [Rechtbank Den Haag], [W v State Secretary for Justice and Security \(Staatssecretaris van Justitie en Veiligheid\)](#), NL22.10458, 20 June 2024. Link redirects to the English summary in the EUAA Case Law Database.

[216](#)

European Union, Court of Justice of the European Union [CJEU], [CV v Ministerstvo vnitra ?eské republiky, Odbor azylové a migra?ní politiky](#), C-406/22, ECLI:EU:C:2024:841, 4 October 2024. Link redirects to the English summary in the EUAA Case Law Database

[217](#)

European Union, Court of Justice of the European Union [CJEU], [B.F. v Kypriaki Dimokratia \[Barouk\]](#), C-283/24, ECLI:EU:C:2025:236, 3 April 2025. Link redirects to the English summary in the EUAA Case Law Database.

[218](#)

Rechtbank Den Haag. 11-03-2025. NL24.1518. ECLI:NL:RBDHA:2025:3726.
<https://uitspraken.rechtspraak.nl/details?id=ECLI:NL:RBDHA:2025:3726>