## CASE LAW COVER PAGE TEMPLATE

Name of the court <sup>1</sup> (E Court of Zwolle	nglish name in brack	ets if the court's la	nguage is not English):	
Date of the decision:	(yyyy/mm/dd) 2013/05/17	Case number: <sup>2</sup> AWB 12/11727,		
		12/11734 and		
		12/11741		
Parties to the case: for	ır Iraqi nationals and	the State Secretar	y of Security and Justice	
Decision available on t	the internet? Yes	⊠ <u>No</u>		
If yes, please provide the lin	k:			
(If no, please attach the deci-	sion as a Word or PDF file)	:		
Language(s) in which	the decision is written	n: Dutch		
Official court translation (If so, which):	ion available in any of	ther languages?	Yes ⊠No	
Countr(y)(ies) of origin	n of the applicant(s):	Iraq		
Country of asylum (or applicant(s): The Neth		ssness aspects, cou	ntry of habitual residence) of the	
Any third country of relevance to the case: <sup>3</sup>				
Is the country of asylu	m or habitual residen	ice narty to:		
The 1951 Convention re		<u> </u>	of the Convention on which the	
of Refugees		decision is based:		
⊠Yes □N-		Auticle 1E (e)		
∐No		Article 1F (c)		
(Only for cases with st			of the Convention on which the	
The 1954 Convention re	elating to the Status	decision is based:		
of Stateless Persons  Yes				
No				
(Only for cases with st			f the Convention on which the	
The 1961 Convention on the Reduction		decision is based:		
of Statelessness Yes				
□No				
(For AU member state	•		f the Convention on which the	
Convention governing the specific aspects of		decision is based:		
refugee problems in Afr	rica			

For EU member states: please indicate	Relevant articles of the EU instruments referred to in the	
which EU instruments are referred to in the	decision:	
decision	-Council Directive 2004/83/EC	
	-Preamble 31 of the (recast) Qualification	

Topics / Key terms: (see attached 'Topics' annex):			
Applicant, an Iraqi asylum seeker is denied asylum and considered to have performed acts as mentioned in article 1F(c) of the Refugee Convention. According to the State Secretary the applicant has acted in breach of the Oil for Food Programme (OFFP) of the UN by selling oil during the period the OFFP was applicable.			
<b>Key facts (as reflected in the decision):</b> [No more than 200 words]			
Applicants (IC and his family) have handed over two letters written by UNHCR The Netherlands on 18 April and 6 July 2012, concerning the specific situation of the applicant. In these letters UNHCR provides an argumentation as regards Article 1 F (c) of the Refugee Convention. UNHCR argues this provision is to be interpreted and applied highly restrictively. UNHCR emphasizes that in Preamble 31 of the (recast) Qualification Directive, specific mention is made to terrorism and that the preamble does not contain a reference to UN- Resolutions in general. Further reference is made to paragraph 163 of the UNHCR Handbook in light of the appeal for a restrictive independent application of article 1F (c) of the Refugee Convention (meaning an application of Article 1F c while not applying Article 1F (a) and/or Art 1F (b) of the Refugee Convention) .			
The Court of Zwolle sees itself for the question whether or not the acts performed by the applicant can be deemed to fall under the scope of Article 1 F (c) of the Refugee Convention. The Court first considered that the applicant knew that he was acting in breach with the OFFP resolution.			

Key considerations of the court (translate key considerations (containing relevant legal reasoning) of the decision; include numbers of relevant paragraphs; do not summarize key considerations) [max. 1 page]

Disclaimer: This is an unofficial translation, prepared by UNHCR. UNHCR shall not be held responsible or liable for any misuse of the unofficial translation. Users are advised to consult the original language version or obtain an official translation when formally referencing the case or quoting from it in a language other than the original.

The Court Zwolle does however not follow the stance of the State Secretary for the following reasons:

- -Resolution 986 (1995) of the UN (OFFP) does not mention any principles of the UN. The State Secretary was not able to motivate how applicant was acting in breach of a principle or purpose of the UN by acting in breach of the OFFP. The State Secretary admitted during the Court session that the principles and purposes of the UN are broadly phrased and that acting in contravention of a resolution not always constitutes a breach with a purpose or principle.
- -The Court states the following:
- "Also UNHCR, a recognized authoritative organization, has mentioned in its letter of 18 April 2012 that an independent application of Article 1 F (c) (meaning an application not in relation to Article 1F (a) and/or 1 F (b) ) should take place restrictively...The State Secretary has not elaborated how he took into account the recommendation to be restrictive with regard to the application of Article 1F (c) refugee Convention.

According to paragraph 15 of the preamble of the Qualification Directive the UNHCR Handbook contains valuable instructions for the application of EU law. "Further reference is made in this context to paragraph 22 of the Preamble, which reads as follows:-

(22) Acts contrary to the purposes and principles of the United Nations are set out in the Preamble and Articles 1 and 2 of the Charter of the United Nations and are, amongst others, embodied in the United Nations Resolutions relating to measures combating terrorism, which declare that «acts, methods and practices of terrorism are contrary to the purposes and principles of the United Nations» and that «knowingly financing, planning and inciting terrorist acts are also contrary to the purposes and principles of the United Nations."

The Court considers that the given examples with regards to terrorist acts are not be equated with the acts performed by applicant.

- -The Court further deems that the State Secretary did not clarify the reasons behind the amendment to the Aliens Circular, which removed the link between the applicability of Article 1 F (c) and Articles 1F (a) and 1F (b) Refugee Convention. In this light the Court refers to paragraph 162 of the UNHCR Handbook, which mentions that acts falling under article 1 F (c) Refugee Convention "(..) must also be of a criminal nature."
- -The Court also refers to the following section from the Background Note of UNHCR on the Application of Exclusion Clauses: "Article 1 F (c) should be reserved for situations where the act and consequences meet a high threshold defined in terms of gravity of the act in question"
- The State Secretary considered the applicant did not perpetrate human rights violations but had deemed the acts of applicant of a criminal nature. The Court decides that the State Secretary failed to mention where these acts are mentioned as being of a criminal nature.

The Court considers that Article 1F (c) Refugee Convention has been applied unjustifiably.

Appeal of applicant grounded

Other comments or references (for example, links to other cases, does this decision replace a previous decision?)				

## **EXPLANATORY NOTE**

- 1. Decisions submitted with this form may be court decisions, or decisions of other judicial, quasi-judicial and administrative bodies.
- 2. Where applicable, please follow the court's official case reference system.
- 3. For example in situations where the country of return would be different from the applicant's country of origin.

For any questions relating to this form, please contact the RefWorld team at the address below.

## Please submit this form to:

Protection Information Unit Division of International Protection UNHCR Case Postale 2500 1211 Genève 2 Dépôt Switzerland

Fax: +41-22-739-7396 Email: refworld@unhcr.org