

INTERROGATING YOUNG SUSPECTS

Procedural Safeguards
from a Legal Perspective

Michele PANZAVOLTA
Dorris DE VOCHT
Marc VAN OOSTERHOUT
Miet VANDERHALLEN
(eds.)



intersentia

Cambridge – Antwerp – Portland

Intersentia Ltd
Sheraton House | Castle Park
Cambridge | CB3 0AX | United Kingdom
Tel.: +44 1223 370 170 | Email: mail@intersentia.co.uk

Distribution for the UK:
NBN International
Airport Business Centre, 10 Thornbury Road
Plymouth, PL6 7 PP
United Kingdom
Tel.: +44 1752 202 301 | Fax: +44 1752 202 331
Email: orders@nbninternational.com

Distribution for the USA and Canada:
International Specialized Book Services
920 NE 58th Ave. Suite 300
Portland, OR 97213
USA
Tel.: +1 800 944 6190 (toll free)
Email: info@isbs.com

Distribution for Austria:
Neuer Wissenschaftlicher Verlag
Argentinierstraße 42/6
1040 Wien
Austria
Tel.: +43 1 535 61 03 24
Email: office@nwv.at

Distribution for other countries:
Intersentia Publishing nv
Groenstraat 31
2640 Mortsel
Belgium
Tel.: +32 3 680 15 50
Email: mail@intersentia.be

Interrogating Young Suspects. Procedural Safeguards from a Legal Perspective
Michele Panzavolta, Dorris de Vocht, Marc van Oosterhout and Miet
Vanderhallen (eds.)

© 2015 Intersentia
Cambridge – Antwerp – Portland
www.intersentia.com | www.intersentia.co.uk

Cover photo © Alexander Raths-Shutterstock

ISBN 978-1-78068-299-0
D/2015/7849/83
NUR 824

With the financial support of the European Community



Sole responsibility for the contents of this publication lies with the authors and the Commission is not responsible for any use made of the information contained therein.

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data. A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library.

No part of this book may be reproduced in any form, by print, photoprint, microfilm or any other means, without written permission from the publisher.

PREFACE AND ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This book is the result of the first part of the European Commission funded research project *Protecting Young Suspects in Interrogations: a study on safeguards and best practice*.¹ The project consists of a legal comparative study, empirical research and the merging of the legal and empirical findings, and its aim is to identify legal and empirical patterns in the procedural protection of juvenile suspects during pre-trial interrogation. The legal study underlying this volume consisted of comparative research into existing procedural safeguards for juvenile suspects during interrogation in the legal frameworks of five selected Member States of the European Union: Belgium, England and Wales, Italy, Poland and the Netherlands. The results of the empirical research, as well as the merging of the legal and empirical findings resulting in a proposal for European minimum rules and best practice on the protection of juvenile suspects during interrogation, will be published in a second volume.

The successful completion of this project has been the joint effort of a large group of people. First and foremost we would like to thank our academic partners – and in-country researchers – for their dedication to the project and the incredible amount of high-quality work they delivered: Claudia Cesari, Deborah Felice, Jackie Hodgson, Vicky Kemp, Justyna Kuzstal, Joachim Meese, Vania Patanè and Barbara Stańdo-Kawecka. Comparative legal research can at times be extremely challenging because it is not easy to convey the nuances of one's own legal system outside its original language and culture. It was thanks to the large knowledge, flexibility, open-mindedness, patience and tenacity of our partners that we only experienced the positive sides of comparative research. Working with them has been an incredibly enriching experience, not only confined to legal matters.

The research and the project as a whole have also benefited enormously from the advice and assistance offered by our supporting partners: PLOT Limburg and Defence for Children who provided support in organising project events, employing social media and disseminating research findings. Thanks particularly to Maartje Berger for her useful practical information and, above all, for her passion and dedication to improving the procedural protection of children.

¹ The project was funded by a Criminal Justice Action Grant of the European Commission (JUST/2011/JPEN/AG2909).

The project has benefited from the supervision of a Steering Committee, an advisory board of experts composed of leading scholars in the field of juvenile justice and criminal law coming from different jurisdictions: Prof. Ray Bull, Prof. Frieder Dünkel, Prof. Gerard de Jonge, Prof. Taru Spronken and Prof. Anette Storgaard. We thank them for their valuable guidance and constant feedback while setting up and conducting the research.

Managing and coordinating the project has been the task of the entire Maastricht project team, but three of the four members of the team (Dorris, Michele and Miet) would like to emphasise that it is in particular thanks to the outstanding daily effort of Marc van Oosterhout that everything has run smoothly and efficiently. In addition to conducting large strands of the legal and empirical research, Marc has been responsible for the many organisational and administrative tasks, ranging from setting up project meetings to managing the project website, and many others. Marc has taken up these diverse, challenging duties with the utmost positivity and perseverance and he has proven to be of inestimable value to the project.

The administration of the project was carried out by Maastricht University. Special thanks go to Diana Schabregs for her hard work in the financial management of this project, to Yleen Simonis for organising the final project conference and to the student assistants who have worked with us at different stages of the project: Jakoline Winkels, Elisabeth Pirotta and Jennifer Etoré.

We thank Kris Moeremans and the staff of Intersentia for their involvement in publishing this book.

Finally, we would like to thank the European Commission for funding this project. We truly hope that its results may contribute to the current debate on how to effectively strengthen the protection of juvenile suspects during the initial stages of criminal proceedings.

Michele Panzavolta
Dorris de Vocht
Marc van Oosterhout
Miet Vanderhallen

February 2015

CONTENTS

<i>Preface and Acknowledgements</i>	v
<i>List of Abbreviations</i>	xix
<i>Biographies</i>	xxi

Chapter 1.

Introduction

Michele PANZAVOLTA and Dorris DE VOCHT	1
1. The topic and aim of this study	1
2. Setting the scene: juveniles and criminal proceedings	1
2.1. Typologies of juvenile justice systems	3
2.2. Changing philosophies.	5
3. The interrogation of juvenile suspects	7
4. This book and the project ‘Protecting Young Suspects in Interrogations’	8
5. The countries involved in this study.	9
6. Harmonising juvenile suspects’ rights	10
7. Existing international and European safeguards	12
7.1. CRC and other UN instruments.	13
7.1.1. General principles.	13
7.1.2. Specific safeguards	16
7.2. ECHR and Strasbourg case law.	18
7.3. Other Council of Europe documents and sources.	22
7.4. The current supranational framework: practical and effective?	25
8. Harmonisation within the European Union.	27
8.1. The ‘Roadmap’	29
8.2. Proposal for a Directive on children suspected or accused in criminal proceedings	32
8.2.1. The right to be informed on rights.	33
8.2.2. The right to have an appropriate adult involved	34
8.2.3. The right to legal assistance.	35
8.2.4. The right to an individual assessment.	36
8.2.5. The right to have interviews audio-visually recorded.	37
9. The methodological approach	38
9.1. The functional method.	39
9.2. The country reports and the common template.	40

9.3. Challenges in describing national law	42
9.4. Definitions	43
Bibliography	44

Chapter 2.

Balancing the Need for Protection and Punishment of Young Delinquents.

Country Report Belgium

Marc VAN OOSTERHOUT and Joachim MEESE	51
I. THE BELGIAN JUVENILE JUSTICE SYSTEM: GENERAL OVERVIEW	51
1. Background	51
1.1. General features of the system	51
1.1.1. Sources of juvenile (criminal) justice in Belgium	52
1.1.2. Underlying ideology of Belgian juvenile justice	53
1.2. Brief history of and current trends in criminal juvenile justice policy	54
1.2.1. The Youth Protection Act of 1965	55
1.2.2. Reform: the laws of 15 May 2006 and 13 June 2006 and sixth state reform	57
2. Structure and main characteristics of the Belgian juvenile justice system	60
2.1. Minimum age of criminal liability	60
2.2. Definition of juvenile and relevant categories	60
2.2.1. Transfer of the juvenile to criminal law	61
2.2.2. Requirements of transferral	62
2.2.3. Procedure of transferral	63
2.2.4. Consequences of transferral	63
2.2.5. Accelerated transferral	65
2.2.6. Transferral in case of traffic infringements	65
2.3. Measures for juveniles	65
2.3.1. Reprimand	66
2.3.2. Community measures	67
2.3.3. Residential placement	68
2.3.4. Custodial measures	68
2.4. Relevant actors	69
2.4.1. Juvenile district council (<i>jeugdparquet</i>)	70
2.4.2. Juvenile courts and juvenile judges	70
2.4.3. Police forces	72
2.4.4. Specialist juvenile lawyers	72
2.4.5. Bridging magistrates (<i>verbindingsmagistraten</i>)	73
2.4.6. Social services	73
2.4.7. Child's Rights Commission	73

2.5.	Main phases of the juvenile ‘criminal’ process	74
2.6.	Alternatives to imposed measures in juvenile court	76
2.6.1.	Disposal by the prosecutor	77
2.6.2.	Restorative measures	77
2.6.2.1.	Mediation	77
2.6.2.2.	Group conferencing (<i>herstelgericht groeps-</i> <i>overleg</i>)	78
2.6.2.3.	Written project	78
2.7.	Some statistics on Belgian juvenile justice	78
2.7.1.	Communal service, learning projects, group conferencing and mediation	79
2.7.2.	Statistics on court imposed measures	81
2.7.3.	Statistics on juvenile crime	81
II.	INTERROGATIONS	82
1.	Interrogations of juveniles in the pre-trial phase	82
1.1.	Concept of interrogation: relevant definitions	82
1.1.1.	The suspect	82
1.1.1.1.	The suspect during pre-trial investigation (<i>vooronderzoek</i>)	83
1.1.1.2.	The suspect during court proceedings	83
1.1.2.	Criminal charge	84
1.1.3.	Pre-trial investigation – investigative stage and judicial investigation	84
1.1.3.1.	The investigative stage	85
1.1.3.2.	The judicial investigation	85
1.1.3.3.	Characteristics of pre-trial investigation	85
1.1.4.	Interrogation	86
1.2.	Types and functions of interrogations	87
1.3.	Authorities empowered to conduct interrogations of juvenile suspects	90
1.3.1.	Police forces	90
1.3.2.	The King’s prosecutor	92
1.3.3.	The juvenile judge	93
2.	The rules for the interrogation of juveniles: general safeguards	94
2.1.	The right to legal assistance	94
2.1.1.	Legal assistance during police interrogation	95
2.1.2.	Legal assistance for juvenile suspects deprived of liberty	96
2.1.3.	Applicable period for legal assistance	96
2.1.4.	The lawyer’s role during police interrogation	97
2.2.	Legal aid	98
2.3.	The right to remain silent and caution	98
2.4.	Presence of appropriate adult	99

2.5.	The case file and the right to disclosure.....	99
2.6.	The right to interpretation.....	100
3.	Carrying out the interrogation.....	101
3.1.	Recording interrogations.....	103
3.2.	The written report following an audio-visually recorded interrogation.....	104
3.3.	Transcripts of the interrogation of a juvenile suspect.....	104
4.	Results of the interrogation.....	106
5.	Remedies and sanctions.....	106
6.	Dissemination of interrogations and protection of privacy.....	107
6.1.	The right to privacy for juvenile suspects.....	107
6.2.	Trial behind closed doors and dissemination of results of juvenile proceedings.....	107
6.3.	A separate trial for juveniles.....	109
7.	Relevant comparisons.....	109
7.1.	Rules for hearing juvenile witnesses and victims.....	110
7.1.1.	Persons attending the questioning.....	110
7.1.2.	Location and registration of the questioning.....	110
7.2.	The hearing of a juvenile suspect by social services.....	112
7.3.	European Arrest Warrant proceedings.....	112
III.	CONCLUSIONS.....	114
	Bibliography.....	115

Chapter 3.

Ensuring ‘Appropriate’ Protections for Young Suspects.

Country Report England and Wales

Jacqueline HODGSON and Vicky KEMP..... 123

I.	THE JUVENILE JUSTICE SYSTEM IN ENGLAND AND WALES: GENERAL OVERVIEW.....	123
1.	Background.....	123
1.1.	General features of the system.....	123
1.1.1.	Statute.....	124
1.1.2.	Procedural rules.....	124
1.1.3.	International standards.....	124
1.1.4.	European Union (EU) law.....	125
1.1.5.	Civil law.....	126
1.2.	Brief history of and current trends in juvenile justice policy.....	127
1.3.	General principles of national juvenile law and juvenile criminal justice.....	130
1.4.	Models of juvenile justice in England and Wales.....	132
1.5.	The treatment of juveniles in criminal proceedings.....	134

2.	Structure and main characteristics of the juvenile justice system in England and Wales	136
2.1.	Minimum age of criminal liability.....	136
2.2.	Definition of juvenile and relevant categories	136
2.3.	Relevant actors.....	137
2.3.1.	Youth Offending Team (YOT)	137
2.3.2.	Police.....	138
2.3.3.	Crown Prosecution Service (CPS).....	138
2.3.4.	Judiciary.....	138
2.3.5.	Defence solicitors	138
2.3.6.	Appropriate adults	140
2.4.	Main phases of the juvenile criminal process	141
2.4.1.	Arrest and detention	141
2.4.2.	Legal rights under PACE.....	142
2.4.3.	Charging and bail decisions	143
2.4.4.	Court proceedings	144
2.5.	Court sanctions for juveniles	147
2.6.	Alternatives to criminal proceedings.....	151
II.	INTERROGATIONS.....	153
1.	Interrogations of juveniles in the pre-trial phase	153
1.1.	Concept of interrogation: relevant definitions.....	153
1.1.1.	Arrest and detention	154
1.1.2.	The interrogation	154
1.1.3.	'Voluntary' interviews	155
1.1.4.	Mediation and diversion	156
1.2.	Timing of interrogations and the pre-charge process.....	156
1.3.	Authorities empowered to conduct interrogations of juvenile suspects.....	157
2.	The rules for the interrogation of juveniles: general safeguards.....	158
2.1.	The right to legal assistance.....	158
2.2.	Legal aid	161
2.3.	The right to remain silent.....	161
2.4.	Right to information: police caution	163
2.5.	Presence of appropriate adult	164
2.6.	The right to interpretation and translation.....	165
3.	Carrying out the interrogation	166
3.1.	Recording police interrogations	166
3.2.	Questions and interrogation techniques.....	167
3.3.	Duration of interrogations.....	167
4.	Outputs of the interrogation	168
5.	Remedies and sanctions	169
6.	Dissemination of interrogations	169

7.	Locations of interrogations	170
8.	Interviewing juveniles as victims and witnesses	170
III.	CONCLUSIONS.....	171
	Bibliography	172

Chapter 4.

Between Respecting ‘Traditional’ Safeguards and Modern Needs of Protecting Juveniles. Country Report Italy

	Claudia CESARI	179
I.	THE ITALIAN JUVENILE JUSTICE SYSTEM: GENERAL OVERVIEW	179
1.	Background.....	179
1.1.	General features.....	179
1.2.	History and current trends	183
1.3.	Fundamental principles.....	186
2.	Structure and main characteristics of the Italian juvenile justice system	189
2.1.	The juvenile	189
2.2.	Relevant actors.....	190
2.3.	Main phases of the proceedings	192
2.4.	The alternatives: diversion mechanisms	198
2.5.	The set of sanctions.....	201
II.	INTERROGATIONS.....	203
1.	Introduction	203
2.	General features of interrogations of juveniles during investigations... ..	204
2.1.	Concept of interrogation	204
2.2.	Concept of interrogation in relation to concept of charge	205
2.3.	Different forms of questioning the suspect: ‘interrogation’ and ‘summary information’	205
2.4.	Assessment of the juvenile’s capacity to be interrogated	209
3.	The rules for the interrogation of juveniles: general safeguards.....	210
3.1.	The right to legal assistance.....	210
3.1.1.	Information on the right to legal assistance.....	210
3.1.2.	The right to consultation of a lawyer.....	211
3.1.3.	The right to have a lawyer present during interrogation ...	212
3.1.4.	Appointment of a lawyer ex officio and legal aid.....	212
3.2.	The right to remain silent.....	214
3.3.	The right to be informed on rights.....	216
3.4.	Information on the charges.....	221
3.5.	The right to interpretation and translation.....	222
4.	The rules for interrogation of juveniles: special safeguards	224
4.1.	Specialisation of authorities	224

4.2. The right to presence of an appropriate adult and social service personnel	225
4.3. The right to special assistance in organising the defence	227
4.4. Presence of experts and the interrogation of juvenile witnesses ...	229
5. Carrying out the interrogation of a juvenile suspect	230
5.1. Methods of interrogation	230
5.2. Recording of the interrogation	231
5.3. Location of the interrogation	233
6. Results of the interrogation	233
7. Remedies and sanctions	234
III. CONCLUSIONS	235
Bibliography	236

Chapter 5.

Protecting Juvenile Suspects in a Pedagogical but Punitive Context.

Country Report the Netherlands

MARC VAN OOSTERHOUT and DORRIS DE VOCHT	241
I. THE DUTCH JUVENILE JUSTICE SYSTEM: GENERAL OVERVIEW	241
1. Background	241
1.1. General features of the system	241
1.2. Brief history of and current trends in juvenile justice policy	243
1.3. General principles of national juvenile law and juvenile criminal justice	245
2. Structure and main characteristics of the Dutch juvenile justice system	246
2.1. Minimum age of criminal liability	246
2.2. Definition of juvenile and relevant categories	247
2.3. Relevant actors	249
2.4. Main phases of the juvenile criminal process	252
2.5. Sanctions for juveniles	257
2.6. Alternatives to criminal proceedings	259
II. INTERROGATIONS	262
1. Interrogations of juveniles in the pre-trial phase	262
1.1. Concept of interrogation: relevant definitions	262
1.1.1. Suspect	263
1.1.2. Charge – first formal allegations towards a suspect	263
1.1.3. Investigative stage	264
1.1.4. Interrogation	264
1.2. Types and functions of interrogations	266
1.2.1. Different types of interrogations	266
1.2.2. Formal interrogations	267

1.2.3.	Material interrogations	268
1.2.4.	Other forms of ‘interrogation’	270
1.3.	Authorities empowered to conduct interrogations of juvenile suspects	271
1.3.1.	Police forces	271
1.3.2.	Public prosecutor	272
1.3.3.	Juvenile judges	273
2.	The rules for the interrogation of juveniles: general safeguards	274
2.1.	Relevant legal sources and scope	274
2.2.	The right to legal assistance	275
2.2.1.	The right to consult with a lawyer before interrogation	277
2.2.2.	The right to legal assistance during interrogation	278
2.2.3.	Waiver of the right to legal assistance	279
2.2.4.	Duty legal assistance	280
2.2.5.	<i>Ex officio</i> appointment of (duty) lawyers	281
2.2.6.	Specialisation of lawyers	281
2.2.7.	The right to legal aid for juvenile suspects	282
2.2.8.	Informing the (juvenile) suspect of legal assistance and legal aid	282
2.2.9.	Juvenile suspect-lawyer consultations	283
2.2.10.	The role of the lawyer during interrogation	283
2.3.	The right to remain silent	284
2.3.1.	Informing the (juvenile) suspect of the right to remain silent	284
2.3.2.	Possible consequences of exercising the right to remain silent	285
2.4.	Presence of appropriate adult	285
2.4.1.	Procedure for arranging for and requirements of a trusted person	286
2.4.2.	Role and task of the trusted person	287
2.4.3.	Waiver of the right to be assisted by a trusted person	288
2.5.	The right to interpretation and translation	288
2.6.	The right to information	289
2.6.1.	The right to be informed of rights	289
2.6.2.	The right to be informed of the case	290
2.7.	Relevant safeguards in other ‘interrogations’	292
2.7.1.	The caution in formal interrogations – <i>voorgeleiding</i> and <i>habeas corpus</i> hearing	292
2.7.2.	Legal assistance during Halt deliberations	292
2.7.3.	Legal assistance during the prosecutorial disposition hearings	293

2.7.4.	Legal assistance during <i>habeas corpus</i> and pre-trial detention hearing	293
2.7.5.	Safeguards during mediation proceedings.....	293
3.	Carrying out the interrogation	294
3.1.	The use of coercion	294
3.2.	Number, duration and structure of interrogations	296
3.3.	Timing of the interrogation.....	296
3.4.	Assessment of fitness for interrogation	297
3.5.	Rules on posing questions to juvenile suspects and structure of interrogations.....	297
3.6.	Location of juvenile interrogations	298
3.7.	Audio and audio-visual recording of interrogations of juvenile suspects.....	298
3.8.	Transcripts of the interrogation of a juvenile suspect.....	299
4.	Outputs of the interrogation	300
5.	Remedies and sanctions	301
6.	Dissemination of results of interrogation and protection of privacy ...	304
7.	Rules for hearing juveniles as witnesses and victims.....	305
III.	CONCLUSIONS.....	307
	Bibliography	309

Chapter 6.

Procedural Complexity within a Welfare Approach.

Country Report Poland

	Barbara STAŃDO-KAWECKA and Justyna KUSZTAL.....	313
I.	THE POLISH JUVENILE JUSTICE SYSTEM: GENERAL OVERVIEW	313
1.	Background.....	313
1.1.	Main sources of Polish criminal and juvenile law.....	313
1.2.	Historical development of juvenile law	316
1.2.1.	The approach to juvenile offenders in the codes of 1928 and 1932.....	317
1.2.2.	The Juvenile Act of 1982	318
1.2.3.	Developments after 1982.....	319
1.3.	General principles of juvenile law.....	320
2.	Structure and main characteristics of the Polish juvenile justice system	322
2.1.	Minimum age of criminal liability.....	322
2.2.	Definition of juvenile and relevant categories	324
2.3.	Proceedings in juvenile cases	326
2.3.1.	Structure of juvenile proceedings before the 2013 amendment	326

2.3.1.1.	Explanatory proceedings	327
2.3.1.2.	Court (adjudicatory) proceedings.	330
2.3.1.3.	Principles of criminal procedure in correctional proceedings	331
2.3.2.	Structure of juvenile proceedings since the 2013 amendment	333
2.4.	Provisional measures	334
2.5.	Relevant actors.	336
3.	Sanctions for juveniles	338
3.1.	Educational measures.	338
3.2.	Medical measures	339
3.3.	Correctional measures	339
4.	Diversion	342
II.	INTERROGATIONS.	343
1.	Listening to (<i>wysłuchanie</i>) and interrogation of (<i>przesłuchanie</i>) a juvenile	343
1.1.	Listening to (<i>wysłuchanie</i>) a juvenile before the 2013 amendment.	344
1.2.	Listening (<i>wysłuchanie</i>) to a juvenile after the 2013 amendment	346
1.3.	Interrogation by the police in ‘urgent cases’ before the 2013 amendment	347
1.3.1.	Safeguards applicable during interrogation by the police	347
1.4.	Interrogation by the police in ‘urgent cases’ after the 2013 amendment	349
1.4.1.	Rules on carrying out the interrogation	350
1.4.2.	Right to an appropriate adult	351
1.4.3.	Other safeguards applicable during interrogation by the police.	352
2.	Right to a defence.	352
2.1.	Right to a defence before the 2013 amendment	353
2.1.1.	Right to legal assistance during listening to a juvenile by a family judge.	354
2.1.2.	Right to legal assistance during interrogation of a juvenile by the police	354
2.1.3.	Violation of the right to defence in the case of <i>Adamkiewicz v. Poland</i>	355
2.2.	Right to defence after the 2013 amendment	355
3.	Right to an interpreter and translation of documents.	357
4.	European arrest warrant cases.	358
5.	Remedies and sanctions	358
6.	Interrogation of a juvenile witness in criminal and juvenile proceedings.	361
III.	CONCLUSIONS.	362

Bibliography 364

Chapter 7.

Transversal Analysis of the Country Reports. General Patterns

Michele PANZAVOLTA and Dorris DE VOCHT 369

1. Introduction 369

I. SYSTEMS 372

1. All that punishes is of a criminal nature? 372

1.1. Criminal proceedings versus educative or protective proceedings. 372

1.2. Formal criminal nature versus substantive criminal nature 374

1.2.1. Relationship between criminal and non-criminal proceedings 376

1.2.2. Regular criminal proceedings versus diversion proceedings 377

2. The two faces of the juvenile suspect: either juvenile or suspect? 380

2.1. Focus on suspect or juvenile: procedural safeguards are mostly not juvenile related 380

2.2. Being a juvenile does not affect the moment of interrogation 381

3. What is it that protects juveniles: people or rules? 382

3.1. Presumption that the system will protect the juvenile 382

3.2. The more protective the role of the judge, the less need for legal rules. 383

3.3. Protection by people during interrogation not systematic. 383

3.4. Protection by people does not always imply specialisation and training. 383

4. The different manifestations of interrogation 384

4.1. Formal legal definitions of the concept of interrogation 384

4.2. Wide variations in types of pre-trial interrogations 385

4.2.1. Different authorities 386

4.2.2. Different goals 386

4.2.3. Different proceedings. 387

4.3. Wide variations may complicate the applicability of procedural safeguards. 387

5. Who is a juvenile? 388

II. INTERROGATIONS. 389

1. Right to remain silent – just like an adult 389

1.1. Scope and content generally the same as with adult 389

1.2. How information on the right to remain silent is provided for differs widely 390

1.3. Lack of (youth-specific) rules on informing of and explaining the right to remain silent 390

1.4. Detrimental consequences of invoking the right to remain silent . 391

2.	Assistance by adults: appropriate or not?	392
2.1.	Most important youth-specific safeguard but great variations	392
2.2.	The appropriate adult lacks a clear function.	393
2.3.	Different ideas on which adult is (most) appropriate	394
3.	Right to legal assistance for juvenile suspects: necessity or possibility?	395
3.1.	Scope of the right to legal assistance	395
3.2.	Whether the right to legal assistance is mandatory.	396
3.3.	Whether the right to legal assistance is free of charge	398
3.4.	Lack of rules on goal of legal assistance during interrogation.	398
3.5.	Limited obligations for defence lawyers to be specialised	399
4.	The need for specialisation and training	400
4.1.	Legal basis for specialisation and training	401
4.2.	Organisational separation versus training and preparation	401
4.3.	Emphasis on specialisation of (quasi-)judicial authorities	401
5.	One size fits all?	402
5.1.	Uniform approach in legal framing of procedural safeguards	403
5.2.	No individual assessment in the context of interrogation	403
5.3.	No special consideration for extra-vulnerable juveniles.	404
6.	A hole inside interrogation?	405
6.1.	Lack of rules on how to conduct pre-trial interrogations.	405
6.2.	Audio or audio-visual recording as a possibility instead of a mandatory safeguard	406
6.3.	Comparison with rules on interrogating adult suspects and juvenile witnesses	407
7.	The juvenile overrated?	407
7.1.	Not too young to decide.	408
7.2.	Presumption of understanding.	409
7.2.1.	Few rules geared toward proper understanding of rights	410
7.2.2.	Few rules geared toward proper comprehension of proceedings	411
7.2.3.	Lack of youth-specific rules on informing the juvenile about the case	412
8.	What defines the juvenile’s vulnerability?	413
8.1.	Unclear notion of vulnerability (during interrogation)	414
8.2.	Different views on how vulnerability should be compensated for.	414
8.3.	Vulnerability not apparently translated into procedural safeguards.	415
III.	CONCLUSIONS.	416
	Bibliography	417

Annex: Template Country Report. Young Suspects in Interrogations	419
---	------------

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

ASBOs	Anti-Social Behaviour Orders
CC	Criminal Code
CCP	Code of Criminal Procedure
Cost	Constitution of the Italian Republic
CPA	Child Protection Act
CPS	Crown Prosecution Service
CRC	Convention on the Rights of the Child
CWC	Child Welfare Council
C&YP	Children and Young Persons Act
DTO	Detention and Training Order
EAW	European Arrest Warrant
ECHR	European Convention on Human Rights
ECtHR	European Court of Human Rights
FME	forensic medical examiner
HR	Hoge Raad
JA	Juvenile Act
LASPO	Legal Aid Sentencing and Punishment of Offenders Act
NJ	Nederlandse Jurisprudentie
PACE	Police and Criminal Evidence Act
PNDs	Penalty Notices for Disorder
UN	United Nations
VOM	victim-offender mediation
YJA	Youth Justice Act
YOT	Youth Offending Team
YPA	Youth Protection Act

BIOGRAPHIES

Claudia Cesari

Claudia Cesari is a Professor of Criminal Procedure at the University of Macerata Law School (Italy). She graduated *magna cum laude* in criminal procedure from the University of Bologna in 1991 and obtained her PhD in criminal procedure at the same institution in 1997. Cesari served as Director of the Department of Criminal Law and Procedure at Macerata between 2007 and 2013. She now acts as Vice Director of the Law Faculty. Cesari is also Coordinator of the Centre for Studies and Research into Juvenile Justice at Macerata. Cesari's research interests include juvenile justice, rules of evidence, and diversion techniques. She teaches criminal procedure and juvenile criminal justice. Some of Cesari's most relevant recent publications include *L'irripetibilità sopravvenuta* (1999) (on an exception to the hearsay rule) and *Le clausole di irrilevanza del fatto nel sistema processuale penale* (2005) (on facts that do not warrant prosecution). Cesari has both edited and authored recent publications of the Centre for Studies and Research into Juvenile Justice.

Jacqueline Hodgson

Jacqueline Hodgson is Professor of Law at the University of Warwick (United Kingdom). She holds an LLB and PhD and has researched and written on issues within French, English/Welsh and comparative criminal justice, on the role of the criminal defence lawyer, the right to silence, the process of investigation and prosecution, terrorism, miscarriages of justice and suspects' rights. Much of her work draws upon her own externally funded empirical research and she held a British Academy/Leverhulme Senior Research Fellowship from 2009–2010. Key publications include *Custodial Legal Advice and the Right to Silence* (1993), *Standing Accused* (1994), *Criminal Injustice* (2000), *French Criminal Justice* (2005), *The investigation and prosecution of terrorist offences in France* (2006), *Suspects in Europe* (2007), *The extent and impact of legal representation on applications to the Criminal Cases Review Commission* (2009), and *Inside Police Custody* (2014). She has advised Parliamentary Select Committees and EU impact assessment studies, and her research has been relied on by the Special Immigration Appeals Commission and in European Arrest Warrant proceedings. She is an elected member of the JUSTICE Council and a Fellow of the Academy of Social Sciences. This current project on safeguards for juveniles complements her recently completed European Commission-funded project – an empirical comparative study of safeguards for suspects.

Vicky Kemp

Vicky Kemp, a Principal Research Fellow at the University of Nottingham (United Kingdom), is an experienced researcher having conducted extensive empirical studies into the criminal justice system. After having completed her doctorate at the University of Cambridge, which focused on youth justice reforms under the Crime and Disorder Act 1998, she joined the Legal Services Research Centre, an internationally recognised and influential leader in the field of access to justice research. In that role she managed a number of empirical studies, including a survey of people drawn into the criminal process and a study of youth courts, evaluating new innovative arrangements involving duty solicitors based in police stations, and was responsible for a large-scale study into the take-up of police station legal advice. Key publications include *Transforming legal aid: Access to criminal defence services* (2010), 'Children, young people and requests for police station legal advice: 25 years on from PACE' in *Youth Justice* (2011), *Bridewell Legal Advice Study: adopting a 'whole-systems' approach to police station legal advice – Interim and Final Reports* (2012 and 2013) and 'PACE, performance targets and legal protections' in *Criminal Law Review* (2014). She is a member of the International Legal Aid Group and the British Society of Criminology.

Justyna Kuztal

Justyna Kuztal (PhD) is employed as assistant professor in the Institute of Pedagogy of the Jagiellonian University in Kraków (Poland). She graduated in law and pedagogy with a specialisation in social rehabilitation at the Jagiellonian University. She obtained her PhD in 2006 in the field of pedagogy at the same institution. Her doctoral dissertation approached a comparative study of social rehabilitation systems of juvenile delinquents in Poland and Germany. She has worked in various types of research teams and is the author of approximately forty articles in the area of social prevention and rehabilitation and problems of juvenile delinquency from a Polish and an international perspective. Her interests are focused on European trends in social prevention of juvenile delinquency and criminal policy in this area.

Joachim Meese

Joachim Meese is a Doctor of law and has a Master's degree in criminology. He is a Professor at the University of Antwerp (Belgium). Joachim Meese is the author of many academic publications. His doctoral thesis, *De duur van het strafproces (Length of criminal proceedings, 2006)*, considers the concepts of the statutes of limitations and the right to be tried within a reasonable time. This book has become a standard work in Belgium. Joachim Meese is also a lawyer, admitted to the Bar of Ghent in 1999. As a lawyer, he is a managing partner at Van Steenbrugge & Partners. He regularly participates in seminars and conferences on criminal law and criminal procedure.

Marc van Oosterhout

Marc van Oosterhout holds two degrees in law (criminal law and forensics) from Maastricht University (the Netherlands). His main research interests are in the fields of (European) criminal procedure and fundamental (suspects') rights, police proceedings and interrogation. During the course of this research project, Marc van Oosterhout was a researcher at the Department of Criminal Law and Criminology at Maastricht University. Before that he had been appointed as a researcher and tutor at the same institution. Earlier he was involved in another European project studying rights of suspects in police detention during which he conducted fieldwork in the Netherlands and Scotland. Besides empirical research, he was involved in the daily operational tasks that are required in large-scale research projects. Due to his research and operational skills, Marc has conducted legal and empirical research in the Netherlands and Belgium and is part of the project management team. He has also been responsible for social media (project website, LinkedIn and Twitter account) during the project. At present, Marc van Oosterhout is a project manager at AMBER Alert Netherlands where he is responsible for further local embedding of AMBER Alert, organising and analysing an EU regional police cooperation pilot and various other projects.

Michele Panzavolta

Michele Panzavolta is Associate Professor of Criminal Law at the University of Leuven (Belgium) and part-time Assistant Professor at the University of Maastricht (the Netherlands), where he was a Marie-Curie Fellow for a research on intelligence. He graduated from the University of Bologna (Italy) and obtained his doctorate at the University of Urbino (Italy). He was a postdoctoral fellow at the University of Bologna and a visiting scholar at the University of Cambridge. He is a qualified attorney at the Bar of Bologna and has experience as a practicing criminal lawyer in Italy. He specialises in European and international criminal law and in comparative studies on criminal law and procedure. Besides juvenile criminal justice, his research interests are in intelligence-related topics (surveillance, intelligence analysis, relationship between police and judicial bodies and intelligence services, cybercrime, *et cetera*), financial crime and asset recovery and, more generally, the protection of individual rights in criminal matters.

Miet Vanderhallen

Miet Vanderhallen is an Assistant Professor of Criminology at Maastricht University (the Netherlands) and an Assistant Professor of Psychology and Law at Antwerp University (Belgium). She holds a degree and PhD in criminology (Catholic University of Leuven, Belgium). She has conducted extensive empirical studies on various aspects of investigative interviewing, such as rapport building, suspect interviewing, legal advice, training and supervision. Miet

Vanderhallen has published many (inter)national articles and book chapters on investigative interviewing. Recently, she has participated in several EU studies on interviewing suspects, including *Procedural rights of suspects in police detention in the EU: empirical investigation and promoting best practice* (JUST/2010/JPEN/AG/1578). In addition to her research activities, she is involved in interview training programs at various police academies.

Dorris de Vocht

Dorris de Vocht is an Assistant Professor in the Department of Criminal Law and Criminology at Maastricht University (the Netherlands). She holds a degree in law (with honors) and a PhD from the same institution. In 2009 she successfully defended her doctoral thesis on the right to legal assistance in post-communist Poland. She has a special interest in procedural safeguards for suspects and defendants especially from a comparative (ECHR as well as EU) perspective. After obtaining her doctorate, she has participated in several EU-funded comparative legal studies such as *EU Procedural Rights in Criminal Proceedings* (JSL/2008/D3/002). She coordinates and teaches various bachelors and masters courses in the field of criminal (procedural) law and is a regular author in various Dutch journals and commentaries, such as *Tekst and Commentaar Strafvordering* (C.P.M. Cleiren and J.F. Nijboer, eds.). Since 2014 she is also a deputy judge with the District Court of Limburg.

Barbara Stańdo-Kawecka

Barbara Stańdo-Kawecka is Professor of Law and Head of the Department of Penitentiary Law and Policy at the Faculty of Law, Jagiellonian University in Kraków (Poland). She graduated in special pedagogy and law from the Jagiellonian University. At the same institution she obtained her PhD and defended her habilitation thesis. Her main research interests are on criminal policy, juvenile law, prison systems and penitentiary policy. She took part in several international research projects concerning juvenile justice, restorative justice and prison systems. Her past publications include chapters on juvenile justice system in Poland (in *Juvenile Justice Systems in Europe: Current Situation and Reform Developments*, 2010) and long-term prisoners in Poland (in *Long-Term Imprisonment and Human Rights*, 2014).