

Application of the European Arrest Warrant by the Polish Law Enforcement

Tomasz Słapczyński¹

¹Jagiellonian University

Abstract —The European Arrest Warrant (EAW) is undoubtedly the result of the introduction of cross-border simplified court proceedings. In its regulations, suspects and accused persons are transferred for the purpose of prosecuting offenses or executing a sentence of deprivation of liberty or a detention order involving the deprivation of liberty. A European arrest warrant issued by a judicial authority of a Member State is valid throughout the territory of the European Union. The beginning of its application in Poland dates from 1st January 2004. It replaced the extradition procedure, which was previously applied by the member states of the Union. The mechanism of the EAW is based on the principle of mutual recognition of judicial decisions and is applied in all EU Member States. It is based on the principle of direct contact between judicial authorities. Authorities using the warrant are obliged to respect the procedural rights of suspects and defendants, that is, the right to information, to a lawyer, to an interpreter, etc.

Index terms — European arrest warrant, EU law, criminal law, criminal proceedings, international cooperation.

I. INTRODUCTION

The European Arrest Warrant is a consequence of introduction of a simplified cross-border judicial surrender procedure. The European Arrest Warrant issued by a judicial authority of a Member State, is valid in the entire territory of the European Union. In Poland, the European Arrest Warrant has been operational since 1st January 2004. It has replaced the lengthy extradition procedures that used to exist between the EU countries (E-justice.europa.eu, 2018). EAW is a request by a judicial authority in one EU country to arrest a person in another and surrender them for prosecution, or to execute a custodial sentence or detention order issued in the first country. The mechanism is based on the principle of mutual recognition of judicial decisions. It is operational in all EU countries. It operates via direct contacts between judicial authorities. In applying the EAW, authorities have to respect the procedural rights of suspects or accused persons – such as the right to information, to have a lawyer and an interpreter, and to legal aid as stipulated by law in the country where they are arrested

(E-justice.europa.eu, 2018). The European Arrest Warrant is, to some extent, the effect of the third pillar EU integration process included in 2002/584/JHA: Council Framework Decision of 13th June 2002 on the European Arrest Warrant and the Surrender Procedures between Member States - Statements Made by Certain Member States on the Adoption of the Framework Decision. The EAW institution is an attempt to create the European Union's area of freedom, security and justice. The extension of international cooperation on criminal cases was achieved during a special meeting of the European Council on 15th and 16th October 1999 in Tampere, where a special action plan was initiated with respect to developing a common policy of judicial systems of all EU Member States *as people have the right to expect the Union to address the threat to their freedom and legal rights posed by serious crime*. The Presidency Conclusion no 35 of the European Council special meeting in Tampere reads: *It considers that the formal extradition procedure should be abolished among the Member States as far as persons are concerned who are fleeing from justice after having been finally sentenced, and replaced by a simple transfer of such persons, in compliance with Article 6 TEU. Consideration should also be given to fast track extradition procedures, without prejudice to the principle of fair trial* (Boratyńska et al., 2016). The essence of the European Arrest Warrant is based on the mutual recognition principle.

II. EUROPEAN ARREST WARRANT IN POLAND

The European Arrest Warrant was introduced into the Polish criminal justice system with the country's entry to the European Union, together with other elements of the European legal framework. The implementation was carried out in the Act of 18 March 2004 amending the Code of Criminal Procedure (hereinafter: CCP), which added chapters 65a and 65b concerning issuance and execution of EAWs respectively. Pursuant to rule 607a of CCP (Act of 6 June 1997, Code of Criminal Proceedings): *if it is suspected that a person prosecuted for an offence falling under the jurisdiction of Polish criminal courts may be staying in the territory of a*



Member State of the European Union, a geographically appropriate regional court may issue a warrant. In pre-trial proceedings, this is possible upon a motion of a public prosecutor, while in court and executive proceedings, ex officio or upon a motion of a geographically appropriate district court.

The premises of application of the European Arrest Warrant may be divided into positive and negative. Absence of grounds for refusal of a warrant execution stipulated in article 607 b of CCP, is the condition for issuing the warrant. A judicial authority may issue a EAW for two purposes (Buczma et al., 2016):

- a criminal prosecution in relation to acts punishable under jurisdiction of domestic criminal courts;
- a suspicion that the requested person may be staying in the territory of a EU Member State.

The jurisdiction of Polish courts is specified in the provisions of articles 109–113 in relation to article 5 of the Criminal Code (Act of 6 June 1997 the Criminal Code). The arrest warrant may be issued upon a motion or ex officio during pre-trial proceedings as well as during court and executive proceedings. Such a motion, however, if filed during court or executive proceedings, shall not give rise to the obligation for the regional court to issue the warrant. The court should each time evaluate the appropriateness of issuing the warrant based on positive premises (article 607a of the Code of Criminal Procedure) as well as on negative premises (article 607b of CCP).

The jurisdiction of the court to issue a warrant in pre-trial proceedings is stipulated on the grounds of articles 31 and 32 of the Criminal Code, in accordance with the place where the crime was committed, not in accordance with the location of the court where the pre-trial proceedings are being conducted. In the court proceedings, the court competent to issue the warrant is the regional court which is responsible for conducting the proceedings or the court in the district where the requested person lived on permanent or temporary basis, or when the whereabouts of the requested person are unknown, where he/she left property eligible for enforcement, or where he/she conducted illegal activity. In executive proceedings, the competent court is the district court which passed the enforceable judgement. The warrant is issued during a court session, in which pursuant to article 96 § 2 CCP, parties have the right to participate, however, the court is not obliged to notify other parties and persons who are not parties about the date of the session. Non-appearance of persons mentioned in article 96 § 2 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, including the prosecutor, does not constitute grounds for calling off the session. The prosecutor, however, is obliged to participate in the district court proceedings related to the issuance of the European Arrest Warrant if the proceedings were initiated by the motion of the prosecutor. The district court issuing the warrant should include in it all the cases in which the requested person was convicted or for which he/she is wanted. Ongoing cases related to the same person, must be referred jointly for a review during the session in which the warrant is to be issued. The decision to issue a warrant is not actionable (Hofmański, Sadzik and Zgrzyzek, 2012). The decision on application to revoke the warrant may not be contested either.

The warrant may not be issued when the requested person is a juvenile. It refers to the situation described in article 16 § 2 of the Act on Juvenile Delinquency Proceedings of 26th October 1982. However, EAW can be issued with respect to a juvenile, who after attaining the age of 15 years shall commit a prohibited act (article 10 § 2 of the Criminal Code). According to the judicature of the Court of Justice of the European Union, a juvenile staying in another state under the law of this state should be surrendered to Poland if he/she was sentenced as an adult. It is also confirmed by article 3 point 3 of the Framework Decision on the European Arrest Warrant, which stipulates that a grounds for mandatory non-execution of the warrant is a situation when the person who is the subject of the arrest warrant may not, owing to his age, be held criminally responsible for the acts on which the arrest warrant is based under the law of the executing state (Świętochowska, 2018). Also domestic judiciary is very uniform in interpretation of circumstances which allow issuance and execution of the European Arrest Warrant with respect to a juvenile. A good example of the Polish judiciary standing in this matter is the resolution of the Supreme Court of 20th July 2006, in which the Supreme Court refused to surrender a juvenile perpetrator to the state where he committed the crime if he would not stand trial before this state's court as an adult.

III. INADMISSIBILITY OF THE EUROPEAN ARREST WARRANT

The provisions of article 607b point 1 CCP state that the court cannot issue a warrant:

- in connection with criminal proceedings against the person prosecuted for the offence punishable by the deprivation of liberty for up to one year;
- in order to execute the penalty of deprivation of liberty for up to 4 months or another measure involving deprivation of liberty for up to 4 months.

Article 607 b of the Code of Criminal Procedure introduces yet another presumption for issuing the warrant i.e. a general clause of 'the interest of the justice system', which, in a sense, breaks the rule of legalism stipulated in article 10 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, and introduces the principle of proportionality as a prerequisite for issuing a EAW. In this sense article 607b assumes optionality of the warrant. The 'interest of the justice system' is a general clause known in the Polish procedure which, in the international turnover, can be applied in the process of taking over or transferring the prosecution (articles 591–592 of the Code of Criminal Procedure) and for solving judicial disputes in the EU (articles 592c–592d of the Code of Criminal Procedure). While applying the rule of interest of the justice system, judges may refer to the aforementioned possible applications of law which emerged with time. The assessment of each and every subsequent content of interest of the justice system lies, first of all, with the requesting body i.e. in pre-trial proceedings it is the prosecutor who conducts the assessment, in court and executive proceedings, the requesting court. The final assessment however, belongs to the regional court issuing the warrant. The premise of interest of the justice system must be fulfilled for the

purposes of a warrant issued for conducting a criminal prosecution, execution of a sentence or a custodial sentence or detention order. To issue a warrant it is not sufficient to claim the interest of the justice system, it is necessary to assess that its weight requires this particular action. The interest of the justice system is related to the goals of criminal proceedings. To determine the scale of interest of the justice system it would be necessary to determine whether the issuance of the warrant would, in real terms, contribute to the achievement of goals stipulated in article 2§1 of the Code of Criminal Procedure. Issuance of the warrant should be preceded with a joint assessment of its usefulness as an instrument leading to the achievement of the aforementioned goals. Issuing a warrant seems pointless, when there are little chances for substantive end to the proceedings or when the costs of the warrant's execution or the costs of the transport of the person being surrendered are disproportionately high compared to the harm caused by the offence or when there is no individual interest on the part of the victim to carry on with the proceedings in Poland. Assessment of compliance with the requirement of the interest of the justice system should be conducted bearing in mind the cross-border dimension of this legal instrument. The interest of the justice system should be expressed in the ability to weigh the effects of the warrant's issuance, both for the Polish and for international organs. In the evaluation of the interest of the justice system, it is necessary to respect human and citizens' rights of the requested person. In order to optimize the process of issuing the European Arrest Warrant and to better fulfil the rule of the interest of the justice system, it is necessary to take into consideration other options such as: the search for requested people pursuant to article 98 of the Executive Criminal Code (Act of 6 June 1997 the Executive Criminal Code), videoconferencing or the probation preventive measure pursuant to article 65c of the Criminal Code. The aforementioned measures may serve as alternatives for the European Arrest Warrant in cases when the requested or convicted person arbitrarily travels to another state and does not appear before Polish judicial authorities when summoned. Another option to be considered is requesting the relevant EU Member State to execute the penalty of deprivation of liberty with conditional suspension pursuant to article 66h of the Criminal Code, so that the court which passed the suspended sentence could recognize the intentions of the convicted person with respect to fleeing to another EU Member State (Buczma et al., 2016).

When the European Arrest Warrant is issued for conducting a criminal prosecution, execution of the sentence or the custodial sentence or the detention order, results directly from the Framework Decision on the European Arrest Warrant, article 2 item 1. In the process of assessment of admissibility of the issuance of the warrant, upper limit penalties binding for the Polish legal system are taken into account, not the limits for these penalties in the executing state. The above mentioned sentence of 4 months of deprivation of liberty refers to the immediate custodial sentence. Issuance of the warrant is not admissible with respect to a penalty of liberty deprivation which has been suspended conditionally unless the order to execute

the penalty was issued pursuant to article 75 of the Criminal Code. In this case the fulfillment of the requirements of the interest of the justice system should be considered. Whereas 'another measure involving deprivation of liberty' within the meaning of item 2, is the safeguard measure from article 93a § 1 item 4 of the Criminal Code. The indefinite character of the measure is not an obstacle for admissibility of issuing the warrant. The Criminal Code does not impose absolute barriers for applying the warrant procedure in order to execute an alternative penalty of deprivation of liberty instead of a fine. However, the condition of interest of the justice system militates against initiating the procedure. First of all, the mechanisms provided for in Chapter 66a should be applied. The interest of the system of justice should also impact the decision of the court issuing the European Arrest Warrant, in case of alternative penalty of deprivation of liberty instead of restriction of liberty. In this case, it is recommended to consider a transfer of the execution of the restriction of liberty under provisions of Chapter 66h. The upper limits of penalties stipulated in article 607b are meaningful only from the perspective of admissibility of issuing the warrant in Poland. The limits may not be used for verification of the warrant due for execution, neither may they become grounds for non-execution of the European Arrest Warrant (Buczma et al., 2016).

IV. THE FORM OF THE EUROPEAN ARREST WARRANT

Pursuant to article 607c of the Code of Criminal Procedure, a warrant should contain the following information:

- name of the requesting court, as well as its address, telephone, fax number and electronic mail address;
- date and place of issuance of the warrant;
- data concerning the identity and nationality of the prosecuted person;
- reference number, type and contents of the final and valid or enforceable judgement in relation to which the warrant has been issued;
- quotation of the description and legal qualification of the offence;
- upper limit of the statutory penalty of deprivation of liberty for the offence in relation to which criminal proceedings are conducted or actually imposed period of deprivation of liberty or of another measure involving deprivation of liberty;
- summary description of the facts of the case;
- description of consequences of the offence, to the extent it is not embodied in the statutory elements of definition of such an offence.

Pursuant to § 2.A a warrant should be translated into the official language of the executing state. The template of the European Arrest Warrant is included in a resolution of the Ministry of Justice on the template of the European Arrest Warrant. The contents of the resolution correspond to the Framework Decision on the European Arrest Warrant.

The information that travels between EU Member States is standardized in the warrant. Undoubtedly, the substantive

content of the forwarded form may impact the decision of the execution authority. Adequate explanation of the factual and legal situation influences the final decision. The form consists of a number of parts (boxes) marked with capital letters: Box A stipulates that if the requested person is of multiple nationalities it is necessary to indicate all of them if known. Box E contains description of the offence which may trigger consequences for verification of double criminality. Box F contains all circumstances relevant to the case. In case of a warrant issued for multiple offences, an aggregate sentence may be imposed in Poland. The warrant is issued by the president of the adjudicating panel. When it comes to the issue of warrant admissibility, according to the Supreme Court (decision of 14 December 2007 of the Court of Appeal in Cracow), the only condition for the assessment of admissibility of the warrant execution are articles 607p, 607r of CCP. These are the only premises for which the warrant may be refused. The request is assessed in compliance with appropriate legal regulations in force in the issuing state, which results from the implementation of appropriate regulations into the domestic legal system. In case of doubts with respect to the assessment of validity of the warrant one may refer to the *Handbook on How to Issue and Execute a EAW*. The issued warrant must then be translated into the official language of the country of its execution. The list of languages accepted by the Member States when receiving an EAW is included in the handbook as Annex IV. Additionally, each state under the agreement is obliged to generate the warrant in English (Buczma et al., 2016).

V. FORWARDING THE EUROPEAN ARREST WARRANT TO THE EXECUTING STATE

Additionally, article 607d of the Code of Criminal Procedure regulates detailed issues of forwarding the warrant to the executing Member State. Pursuant to § 1 if there is a suspicion that the requested person may stay in the territory of a EU Member State, when the location of the requested person is unknown, the prosecutor who issued the warrant forwards its copy to the central Police unit which collaborates with Interpol with a request to initiate international manhunt. Moreover, § 2, 3, 4 stipulate that if the whereabouts of the requested person is known or has been determined, the warrant is forwarded directly to the executing judicial authority, a copy of the warrant shall be handed over to the Minister of Justice. The warrant and all related information and documents may also be forwarded by means of data transmitting devices in such a manner as to permit their authentication. The duty of transmission of the warrant during court proceedings lies with the issuing authority i.e. the court, and in pre-trial proceedings with the prosecutor. The way in which the information is transmitted depends on the possibility to determine the whereabouts of the requested person. When the location of the requested person is known, the issuing judicial authority may transmit the EAW directly to the executing judicial authority. If the issuing judicial authority does not know the competent executing judicial authority, it shall make the requisite enquiries, including through the contact points of the European Judicial Network. When the location of

the requested person is not known, the warrant is forwarded to the International Police Cooperation Bureau i.e. the central Police unit in Poland closely cooperating with Interpol. When the location of the requested person is known, the issuing judicial authority may transmit the arrest warrant directly to the executing judicial authority. In the process of determination of the competent execution authority, the issuing judicial authority may use the information available on the official website of the European Judicial Network (Ejn-crimjust.europa.eu, 2018).

The mode of proceedings in case of the European Arrest Warrant and international manhunt was specified in detail in the resolution of the Minister of Justice of 23rd February 2007 on rules governing the operation of (the) ordinary courts § 326, and in a resolution of the Minister of Justice of 11th September 2014. Additionally, in the rules of internal procedure of common organisational units of the Prosecutor's Office, § 146 and next.

The multiplicity of legal acts regulating this subject matter proves the lack of uniformity of law in this respect, which is a very negative phenomenon. The aforementioned regulations clarify the mode of forwarding the warrant in situations when the location of the requested person is unknown i.e. the warrant is forwarded by means of the Schengen Information System. The warrant is forwarded electronically, additionally its copy as a PDF file as well as the translation of the document in English in DOC, TXT or RTF is sent directly into the e-mail address of the SIRENE Bureau assuring at the same time confidentiality and integrity of information.

VI. ADMISSIBILITY OF PROSECUTION IN COMPLIANCE WITH THE EUROPEAN ARREST WARRANT

According to Article 607e of the Code of Criminal Procedure, the person surrendered as a result of execution of a warrant shall neither be prosecuted for offences other than those that give rise to surrender, nor subject to the enforcement of penalties of deprivation of liberty or other measures involving deprivation of liberty imposed on him/her for such offences. The court which issues the final decision, may not punish the individuals who have been surrendered for offenses other than those for which the original surrender was granted. The session of the court may be attended by the prosecutor and the requested person.

Article 607e § 1 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, implementing article 27 of the Framework Decision on the European Arrest Warrant, contains the so called specialty principle which concerns, most of all, the protection of the sovereignty of the issuing state. Should there be objections with respect to the specialty principle, further decisions on the proceedings must be taken during an additional court session during which the court orders execution of the sentence for offences for which the warrant was granted. Such adjudication is given by the court which issued the final decision in the case, unless the case is referred back in the appeal procedure or cassation. If in cases concerning the grounds for surrender adjudicated more than one court, each of the adjudicating courts is authorized to order execution of the penalty this court imposed. The session may be attended by the prosecutor and

the requested person with his/her attorney. The persons authorized to participate in the procedural action shall be notified, as specified in article 117 § 1 of the Code of Criminal Procedure. The specialty principle is a negative premise for imposing a total sentence which would include penalty of deprivation of liberty for offences other than those that give rise to surrender. Should the charge of specialty be raised during the execution of the warrant with respect to the total sentence, the requested person may be asked to renounce the entitlement to the specialty rule pursuant to 607e § 3 point 7 of the Code of Criminal Procedure. It is also possible to request the executing state to execute penalties for offences not included in the warrant pursuant to article 607e § 1 point 8 of the Code of Criminal Procedure. In order to determine whether a given offence is included in the warrant it is necessary to examine if the hallmarks of the crime as described in the legal description of the offence in the issuing state are the same as those for which the person was surrendered and if there is compliance between the appearing data and the data mentioned in the later proceedings (Buczma et al., 2016).

The surrender and remand detention is usually adjudicated during one session, however, it is permissible to issue the decision on the remand detention first, and only then consider the issue of surrender. The session may be attended by the prosecutor and the attorney of the requested person, additionally article 607 l § 1a of the Code of Criminal Procedure guarantees the requested person the right to be notified about the date of the session. Translation of the warrant is mandatory and is implemented pursuant to article 3 items 6 and 7 of

Directive 2010/64/UE (*Directive 2010/64/EU* of the European Parliament and of the Council of 20 October 2010 on the right to interpretation and translation in criminal proceedings) which indicates three ways of forwarding the translated warrant:

- the prosecutor forwards the translation;
- the court commissions the translation;
- the translation is not commissioned and the requested person is only notified about the content of the warrant.

In theory, it is the prosecutor's duty to forward the translation of the warrant to the court, however, in reality this rule is not strictly observed. Usually, the prosecutors forward the untranslated warrant to the court, and then the court commissions the translation. Each instance of the absence of translation must be justified with specific circumstances. As a last resort, it is possible not to translate the warrant at all and only notify the requested person about its contents as far as it is not detrimental with respect to the execution of his/her powers (Buczma et al., 2016).

VII. CONCLUSIONS

Statistics of the Polish Ministry of Justice (Table 1) show clearly that the institution of the European Arrest Warrant is applied in practice. The Schengen zone, where all kinds of border control are abolished, allows people to move anonymously between the 26 European Union Member States.

TABLE 1.
STATISTICS ON THE EUROPEAN ARREST WARRANT IN POLAND BETWEEN 2013 AND THE FIRST HALF OF 2017

| | | 2013 | | 2014 | | 2015 | | 2016 | | I p. 2017 | | | |
|-------------------------|-----------------------------|--|---|--|---|--|---|--|---|--|---|-------|-----|
| | | Requests of the prosecutor to issue EAW on the basis of article 607a CCP | EAW issued on the basis of article 607a CCP | Requests of the prosecutor to issue EAW on the basis of article 607a CCP | EAW issued on the basis of article 607a CCP | Requests of the prosecutor to issue EAW on the basis of article 607a CCP | EAW issued on the basis of article 607a CCP | Requests of the prosecutor to issue EAW on the basis of article 607a CCP | EAW issued on the basis of article 607a CCP | Requests of the prosecutor to issue EAW on the basis of article 607a CCP | EAW issued on the basis of article 607a CCP | | |
| Total | | 1 | 659 | 2 776 | 529 | 2 681 | 417 | 2 428 | 365 | 2 177 | 228 | 1 166 | |
| with respect to persons | unknown | whose location is | 2 | 227 | 1 026 | 258 | 1 139 | 186 | 974 | 169 | 913 | 100 | 492 |
| | known (one state) | | 3 | 409 | 1 694 | 246 | 1 510 | 225 | 1 419 | 190 | 1 237 | 120 | 655 |
| | known (more than one state) | | 4 | 23 | 56 | 25 | 32 | 6 | 35 | 6 | 27 | 8 | 19 |

SOURCE: (ISWS.MS.GOV.PL, 2019)

In such conditions the European Arrest Warrant is undoubtedly a very efficient and useful tool as it makes it possible to fulfil the rule of the certainty of punishment for the crimes committed on national and international scale. On the negative side, it must be observed that actions involved in the execution of the European Arrest Warrant generate considerable costs. These costs, however, must be considered unavoidable if the warrant is issued for crimes of considerable social noxiousness.

VIII. REFERENCES

Boratyńska, K., Czarnecki, P., Górski, A., Królikowski, M., Warchoń, M. and Ważny, A. (2016). Komentarz do art. 607a. In: A. Sakowicz, ed., *Kodeks postępowania karnego. Komentarz*. Warszawa.

Buczma, S., Hara, M., Kierzyńska, R., Kołodziejki, P., Milewski, A. and Ostropolski, T. (2016). *Komentarz do przepisów k.p.k. regulujących wystąpienie do państwa członkowskiego Unii Europejskiej o przekazanie osoby ściganej na podstawie europejskiego nakazu aresztowania; Postępowanie w sprawach karnych ze stosunków międzynarodowych*. Warszawa.

Council Framework Decision of 13 June 2002 on the European arrest warrant and the surrender procedures between Member States - Statements made by certain Member States on the adoption of the Framework Decision

Directive 2010/64/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of 20 October 2010 on the right to interpretation and translation in criminal proceedings.

Ejn-crimjust.europa.eu. (2018). *European Judicial Network*. [online] Available at: <http://www.ejn-crimjust.europa.eu> [Accessed 14 Jan. 2018].

E-justice.europa.eu. (2018). *Europejski portal e-sprawiedliwość - Europejski nakaz aresztowania*. [online] Available at: https://e-justice.europa.eu/content_european_arrest_warrant-90-pl.do [Accessed 10 Feb. 2018].

Górski, A. (2010). *Europejskie ściganie karne. Zagadnienia ustrojowe*. Kraków.

Hofmański, P., Sadzik, E. and Zgryzek, K. (2012). *Kodeks postępowania karnego Komentarz vol.3*. Warszawa, p.734 and n.

Isws.ms.gov.pl. (2018). *Opracowania wieloletnie / Baza statystyczna / Informator Statystyczny Wymiaru Sprawiedliwości*. [online] Available at: <https://isws.ms.gov.pl/pl/baza-statystyczna/opracowania-wieloletnie/> [Accessed 14 Jan. 2018].

Isws.ms.gov.pl. (2019). *Opracowania wieloletnie / Baza statystyczna / Informator Statystyczny Wymiaru Sprawiedliwości*. [online] Available at: <https://isws.ms.gov.pl/pl/baza-statystyczna/opracowania-wieloletnie/> [Accessed 18 Feb. 2018].

Kuczyński, K. (2005). Znaczenie Europejskiego Nakazu Aresztowania w zwalczaniu terroryzmu w Unii Europejskiej. *Studia Europejskie*, (1).

Świętochowska, E. (2018). Europejski nakaz aresztowania także wobec nieletniego. *prawo.gazetaprawna.pl*. [online] Available at: <https://prawo.gazetaprawna.pl/artykuly/1099680,europejski-nakaz-aresztowania-nieletni.html> [Accessed 24 Jan. 2018].

Trzcńska, J. (2004). Europejski nakaz aresztowania a ekstradycja w prawie polskim. *Prokuratura i Prawo*, (6).