

EXPULSION OF ALIENS

[Agenda item 7]

DOCUMENT A/CN.4/554

Preliminary report on the expulsion of aliens, by Mr. Maurice Kamto, Special Rapporteur

[Original: English/French]
[2 June 2005]

CONTENTS

	<i>Paragraphs</i>	<i>Page</i>
Multilateral instruments cited in the present report		193
Works cited in the present report		194
INTRODUCTION	1–6	194
<i>Chapter</i>		
I. THE CONCEPT OF THE EXPULSION OF ALIENS	7–13	196
II. THE RIGHT TO EXPEL	14–16	197
III. GROUNDS FOR EXPULSION	17–20	197
IV. RIGHTS RELATED TO EXPULSION	21–27	198
V. METHODOLOGICAL ISSUES	28–30	199
ANNEXES		
I. DRAFT WORKPLAN		200
II. PARTIAL BIBLIOGRAPHY		202

Multilateral instruments cited in the present report

	<i>Source</i>
Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms (European Convention on Human Rights) (Rome, 4 November 1950)	United Nations, <i>Treaty Series</i> , vol. 213, No. 2889, p. 221.
Protocol No. 4 to the Convention of 4 November 1950 for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, securing certain rights and freedoms other than those already included in the Convention and in the first Protocol thereto (Strasbourg, 16 September 1963)	<i>Ibid.</i> , vol. 1496, No. A–2889, p. 263.
Protocol No. 7 to the above-mentioned Convention (Strasbourg, 22 November 1984)	<i>Ibid.</i> , vol. 1525, No. 2889, p. 195.
Protocol No. 11 to the Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms of 4 November 1950, restructuring the control machinery established thereby (Strasbourg, 11 May 1994)	<i>Ibid.</i> , vol. 2061, No. A–2889, p. 7.
Convention relating to the Status of Stateless Persons (New York, 28 September 1954)	<i>Ibid.</i> , vol. 360, No. 5158, p. 117.
International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (New York, 16 December 1966)	<i>Ibid.</i> , vol. 999, No. 14668, p. 171.
Optional Protocol to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (New York, 16 December 1966)	<i>Ibid.</i>
American Convention on Human Rights: “Pact of San José, Costa Rica” (San José, 22 November 1969)	<i>Ibid.</i> , vol. 1144, No. 17955, p. 123.
African Charter on Human and Peoples’ Rights (Nairobi, 27 June 1981)	<i>Ibid.</i> , vol. 1520, No. 26363, p. 217.
International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families (New York, 18 December 1990)	<i>Official Records of the General Assembly, Forty-fifth Session, Supplement No. 49, resolution 45/158, annex.</i>

Works cited in the present report

- AFOLAYAN, A. A.
“Immigration and expulsion of ECOWAS aliens in Nigeria”, *International Migration Review* (New York), vol. 22, No. 1, spring 1988, pp. 4–27.
- BLUNTSCHLI, J. C.
Le droit international codifié. French translation by C. Lardy. 5th rev. ed. Paris, Félix Alcan, 1895. 602 p.
- BOGATIN, Marc
“The Immigration and Nationality Act and the exclusion of homosexuals: *Boutilier v. INS* revisited”, *Cardozo Law Review* (New York), vol. 2, No. 2, winter 1981, pp. 359–396.
- BOECK, Charles de
“L’expulsion et les difficultés internationales qu’en soulève la pratique”, *Recueil des cours de l’Académie de droit international de La Haye, 1927–III*. Paris, Hachette, 1928. Vol. 18, pp. 445–650.
- D’HAËM, Rudolph
La reconduite à la frontière des étrangers en situation irrégulière. Paris, Presses Universitaires de France, 1997. (Que sais-je?)
- DUPUY, Pierre-Marie
Droit international public. 7th ed. Paris, Dalloz, 2004. 805 p.
- GRIFFIN, W. Martin
“Colonial expulsion of aliens”, *American Law Review* (St. Louis), vol. XXXIII, 1899, pp. 90–96.
- IRIZARRY Y PUENTE, J.
“Exclusion and expulsion of aliens in Latin America”, *AJIL*, vol. 36, 1942, pp. 252–368.
- JENNINGS, Sir Robert and Sir Arthur WATTS, eds.
Oppenheim’s International Law, vol. I, *Peace*. 9th ed. Harlow, Longman, 1992.
- JULIEN-LAFERRIÈRE, François and Sophie de SÈZE
“France”, in Bruno Nascimbene, ed., *Expulsion and Detention of Aliens in the European Union Countries*. Milan, Giuffrè, 2001, pp. 183–221.
- NASCIMBENE, Bruno and Alessia DI PASCALE
“Synthesis report and conclusions”, in Bruno Nascimbene, ed., *Expulsion and Detention of Aliens in the European Union Countries*. Milan, Giuffrè, 2001, pp. 533–602.
- ODA, Shigeru
“The individual in international law”, in Max Sørensen, ed., *Manual of Public International Law*. London and Basingstoke, Macmillan, 1968, pp. 469–530.
- REWALD, Roman
“Judicial control of administrative discretion in the expulsion and extradition of aliens”, *American Journal of Comparative Law* (Ann Arbor), vol. XXXIV (Supp.), 1986, pp. 451–465.
- SALMON, Jean, ed.
Dictionnaire de droit international public. Brussels, Bruylant, 2001.
- SILVERS, Samuel M.
“The exclusion and expulsion of homosexual aliens”, *Columbia Human Rights Law Review*, vol. 15, No. 2, spring 1984, pp. 295–332.
- SOHN, Louis B. and Thomas BUERGENTHAL, eds.
The Movement of Persons across Borders. Washington, D.C., American Society of International Law, 1992. 193 p. (Studies in Transnational Legal Policy, vol. 23)
- TCHERNOFF, Juda
Protection des nationaux résidant à l’étranger: avec introduction sur la souveraineté des États en droit international. Paris, Pedone, 1899. 544 p.
- TOUCHARD, Jean and others
Histoire des idées politiques, vol. 1, *Des origines au XVII^e siècle*. Paris, Presses Universitaires de France, 1959.
- TWADDLE, Michael, ed.
Expulsion of a Minority: Essays on Ugandan Asians. London, Athlone Press, 1975. 240 p.
- UNITED NATIONS
International Provisions Protecting the Human Rights of Non-Citizens. Study prepared by the Baroness Elles, Special Rapporteur of the Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities (E/CN.4/Sub.2/392/Rev.1). United Nations publications, Sales No. E.80.XIV.2.
- Economic and Social Council. Commission on Human Rights. Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities. Comprehensive examination of thematic issues relating to the elimination of racial discrimination. *The rights of non-citizens*. Working paper submitted by Mr. David Weissbrodt, in accordance with Sub-Commission decision 1998/103. 31 May 1999 (E/CN.4/Sub.2/1999/7)

Introduction

1. The history of mankind has been characterized by mistrust of strangers and the temptation to withdraw from contact with them. There is no need to present a complete picture of this phenomenon, which affects all regions of the world. For example, the Greek city States sought to isolate themselves in an autarkic unit, believing that there was nothing beyond their walls but small tribes of savage barbarians.¹ In Sparta, aliens were banned from the city and accused of disrupting the public order established by law, *eunomia*; already, even in these ancient times, public order was invoked as a justification. From Sparta to Rome, the same attitude prevailed. Aliens were treated as enemies, as seen in the Latin adage: *hostis, hospes*

(stranger, enemy).² Beyond the fortifications marking the boundaries of first the city and then the Empire—such as Hadrian’s wall, dividing England from Scotland, the impressive ruins of which still exist—was the world of aliens denied the status of Romans, where only a banished Roman citizen would venture.

2. Today, the status of aliens is very different from what it was under Roman law; most modern, liberal legislation grants them full civil equality with nationals. During the first half of the twentieth century, there was a wave of openness to aliens in Latin America, to the point

¹ See Touchard and others, *Histoire des idées politiques*, pp. 9–10.

² See United Nations, study prepared by the Baroness Elles, p. 2, para. 11.

that the then Attorney-General Montt of Chile declared that, throughout Latin America, aliens had every advantage except access to high-level posts in Congress.³ Until recently, a similar policy was in force in some African countries. During the first two decades following their independence in the 1960s, it was not unusual for citizens of one African country to occupy high-level posts in the governments of other African States while retaining their nationalities of origin or for large groups of Africans from one country to settle and live peacefully in another African country without following the entry or sojourn procedures or acquiring the nationality of the host State. Such openness also existed among the old European nations, where it has gradually become more widespread as a result of the creation of the European Community.

3. Despite this liberal trend in contemporary legislation, however, the expulsion of aliens remains a common practice on every continent. On the grounds that the right to expel is an inalienable right of the State, States do not hesitate to use it as a shield against aliens whom they view either as a threat to national security or as a potential threat to public order in the host country. For example, this right has been widely invoked against the Chinese, who were the most commonly expelled in the late nineteenth century, especially in the United States of America; at that time China had no place in the family of so-called "civilized" nations and thus could not appeal to the international community, especially as China itself repeatedly invoked the right to expel aliens.⁴ Moreover, the expulsion of aliens in time of war seemed perfectly normal at a time when war between States, even in cases not involving self-defence, was not prohibited by international law and when a declaration of war was automatically considered to make the people of the belligerent States each other's enemies. One late-nineteenth-century author wrote: "Nothing could be clearer than the right of the British executive in time of war to exclude the subjects of the unfriendly power."⁵

4. The spread of freedom and democracy and the development of humanitarian and human rights law have shown that a government can go to war even against the will of the majority of its people and have led jurists, States and public opinion to distinguish between combatants and non-combatants and between the acts of States and those of individuals. Nevertheless, the expulsion of aliens has become far more common in peacetime than in time of war. Thus, it is no longer a case of aliens from an enemy country versus aliens from a friendly country, nor are the friendly relations between two States necessarily at stake when aliens are expelled; the cause is more likely to be the expelling State's desire to solve a domestic problem. Whether aliens are used as scapegoats⁶ or are the victims of their own misdeeds, the desire to preserve public order

is the primary motive for their expulsion.⁷ The frequent discrepancies between State practice and international law do pose problems in this area.⁸

5. The topic of the expulsion of aliens is of particular interest today insofar as it reveals the contradiction between technical and economic globalization, which promotes greater trade flows between nations, and the raising of barriers based on sovereignty which hinder or block the movement of persons by creating selection procedures for distinguishing between those who have the right to enter and reside in the territory of a State or group of States, and those who lack that right. With the development and rapidity of modern means of transport, migratory flows from one country to another and from one part of the world to another have literally exploded, intensified by development inequalities between nations which lead more and more marginalized people from poor countries to seek entry into rich countries in the hope of a better future.⁹ But, paradoxically, national borders are becoming less permeable and the manner in which aliens are received varies according to all manner of considerations, including the applicants' economic potential, their scientific expertise and even their religious beliefs. The unprecedented scope of international terrorism and the ongoing threat that it represents only make matters worse; they have aggravated national tensions that had long been based primarily on social and economic egotism and xenophobia. The key problem in this area is how to reconcile the right to expel, which seems inherent in State sovereignty, with the demands of international law and, in particular, the fundamental rules of human rights law.

6. This preliminary report seeks to provide an overview of the topic by demonstrating the legal issues that it raises and the problems associated with their consideration. The Special Rapporteur was of the view that the advantage, and the very essence, of a preliminary report are to present the topic to be studied in order to explain how he proposes to proceed and to seek guidance from the Commission in that regard. A preliminary report formulates issues and suggests approaches rather than offering final solutions embodied in positive law or, where applicable, suggested by the progressive development of international law. It is in this spirit that the Special Rapporteur proposes, in this report, first to set forth the issues raised by the very idea of the "expulsion of aliens" (chap. I); then to provide an overview of the right to expel in international law (chap. II), the grounds for expulsion invoked in practice (chap. III) and the rights at stake during expulsion (chap. IV); and, lastly, to examine the methodological problems associated with consideration of the topic (chap. V). The manner in which

³ See Irizarry y Puente, "Exclusion and expulsion of aliens in Latin America", pp. 252–253.

⁴ See Griffin, "Colonial expulsion of aliens", pp. 90–91.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 91.

⁶ In 2004, for example, several hundred Cameroonians were expelled from Equatorial Guinea because the regime in power in that country was at risk of destabilization by foreign mercenaries (see "Country report: Cameroon", *The Economist Intelligence Unit* (May 2004)).

⁷ One of the most recent cases is the expulsion on 19 March 2005 of three clergymen of the Universal Church of the Kingdom of God, a religious group founded in Brazil, because the group was burning copies of the Bible in public (*Radio France Internationale*, 19 March 2005).

⁸ See Boeck, "L'expulsion et les difficultés internationales qu'en soulève la pratique".

⁹ To offer an example, the aforementioned study (see footnote 2 above) of the United Nations Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities (p. 1, para. 5) noted, more than 20 years ago, that over 10 million people had emigrated from Europe and another 10 million had immigrated to the European Community since 1945; over 7 million people had been transferred from India to Pakistan since 1947; and about 5 million migrants were working in Africa each year.

the Special Rapporteur proposes to conduct the study of this topic will then be described through a workplan which is placed before the Commission for discussion, provided in annex I to the preliminary report; annex II contains a

bibliography which in no way claims to be exhaustive; its purpose is simply to offer a source of supplementary information which may help to enrich the Special Rapporteur's future work.

CHAPTER I

The concept of the expulsion of aliens

7. The topic, "the expulsion of aliens", is based on two ideas: that of "expulsion" and that of "alien", which must be defined before an attempt is made to identify the rules of international law relating thereto. Because the concept of expulsion can be understood only in relation to that of alien, the latter will be discussed first. "Alien" means an individual who does not hold the nationality of the host country or the country of residence but who is bound by a link of nationality to the State from which he or she comes—the State of origin—or who holds no nationality at all and is thus in a situation of statelessness.¹⁰

8. Viewed as a fact, expulsion may be understood simply as a forced border crossing or exit from the territory of a State by an individual who is compelled to do so. But this description does not provide an adequate legal determination of the concept of expulsion; its legal definition requires particularly close study because it seems to be interwoven with other similar concepts from which it cannot easily be separated. It appeared to the Special Rapporteur that a definition of the concept of expulsion under international law could be proposed only after comparing it with other concepts such as the displacement of populations, exodus, deportation, extradition, refoulement, non-admission, exclusion from a territory, "extrajudicial transfer", "extraordinary transfer", removal from a territory and escort to the border.

9. Most of these concepts share common traits with that of expulsion, but they differ from it in several ways. For example, the same legal concept cannot be applied to both the *MV Tampa* case, which involved a ship flying the Norwegian flag which the Australian and Indonesian Governments would not allow to dock because they did not want to accept the hundreds of Afghan and Iraqi asylum-seekers on board,¹¹ and the March 2004 expulsion of hundreds of Africans of various nationalities from an African country of which some of them were long-time residents.¹²

10. It can easily be agreed that persons displaced within their own country do not fall within the scope of this topic. Non-admission or refusal of admission—a situation in which a person who has not yet entered a State's territory is prevented from doing so—lies on the margins of the topic: it will have to be decided whether it should be included or not. It will also have to be determined whether a person who enters a State's territory clandestinely and

is "removed" from it should be deemed to have been expelled or refused entry and whether the topic should include cases of expulsion by a victorious government in the context of a conflict between two peoples, each seeking exclusive control of the same territory—for example, the hundreds of thousands of Palestinians who were forced to leave or were expelled from their homes and land when the State of Israel was established in 1948, and again following the occupation of a portion of their territory after the Six-Day War in 1967.

11. In this preliminary report, the Special Rapporteur does not intend to embark on a semantic comparison of each of the aforementioned concepts with the central concept of expulsion or to propose responses to the various concerns expressed above. One of the objectives of the first report will be to clarify these concepts, taking the Commission's guidance into account in determining the scope of the concept of the expulsion of aliens for the purpose of developing a set of draft articles. In this report, it will suffice to mention the plethora of terms used in this field, both in legal theory¹³ and in the legislation of certain countries,¹⁴ and to propose an entirely provisional definition of the concept of expulsion with a view to delimiting the scope of the preliminary consideration and discussion of the topic.

12. Following the reasoning of domestic law, "expulsion" can refer to an administrative policy measure enjoining an alien to leave a territory.¹⁵ Under French law, for example, the term "expulsion" is used in reference to aliens whose presence in French territory, even if legal, constitutes a "serious threat to public order".¹⁶ This strict definition of the concept excludes several other measures for the removal of aliens which, in the Special Rapporteur's view, should fall within the scope of the concept within the framework of this topic. The term "removal" seems, at first glance, preferable because it is more comprehensive, but although it is used by some theorists,¹⁷ it has the disadvantage of not being a consecrated legal term.

¹³ For example, scholars speak of removal from a territory (see D'Haëm, *La reconduite à la frontière des étrangers en situation irrégulière* p. 3) and of deportation (see "Governing rule 12: expulsion or deportation of aliens", in Sohn and Buergenthal, *The Movement of Persons across Borders*, pp. 89–97).

¹⁴ See, for example, the French Act No. 86-1025 of 9 September 1986 on conditions governing the entry and stay of aliens in France, in which the terms "expulsion", "escort to the border" and "inadmissibility" are used (*Journal Officiel de la République française*, 12 September 1986).

¹⁵ Salmon, *Dictionnaire de droit international public*, p. 488.

¹⁶ Julien-Laferrère and Sèze, "France", p. 183.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*; see also the title of the book (*Expulsion and Detention of Aliens in the European Union Countries*).

¹⁰ See, *inter alia*, Nascimbene and Di Pascale, "Synthesis report and conclusions", and Dupuy, *Droit international public*, p. 129.

¹¹ On the *MV Tampa* case, see Amnesty International's annual report on the Pacific region of 24 August 2002, entitled "Australia-Pacific—offending human dignity: the 'Pacific Solution'" (www.amnesty.org).

¹² See the expulsions from Equatorial Guinea mentioned above (footnote 6).

13. The Special Rapporteur believes that for the purposes of this topic, the term “expulsion” should be retained but should be interpreted broadly so as to include all measures for removing aliens from the territory of the expelling State. From the point of view of international law, it should be explained that such a measure must be a unilateral legal act—that of a State—and that it is a compulsory measure targeting an individual or group of individuals. Thus, “expulsion” might be provisionally defined as a

legal act in which a State compels an individual or group of individuals who are nationals of another State to leave its territory. The study will show whether the expelled person’s physical crossing of the expelling State’s border corresponds to the concept of expulsion, or whether it is a consequence thereof, and whether a distinction should be made between the legal act of expulsion and the expelled person’s physical act of crossing the border or leaving the territory of the State in question.

CHAPTER II

The right to expel

14. The monitoring by a State of its borders is intended not only to warn it of any invasion by foreign armed forces, but also to protect it from infiltration by aliens seeking peacefully to enter the territory to take advantage of living standards within it.¹⁸ International law therefore recognizes the discretionary power of each State to grant or refuse entry to its territory. Equally, international law recognizes the right of the State itself to set the conditions for the entry and residence of aliens in its territory.¹⁹ In the words of a late-nineteenth century author: “Every country has a right to judge of the terms upon which it will admit foreigners within its borders ... The exercise of that right is one of which no nation has any right to complain.”²⁰

15. Logically, the obverse of the right to regulate the admission or non-admission of aliens is the right to expel them. Every State fully enjoys that right, which is inherent in its sovereignty. It is a principle of customary

international law, which is rarely contested.²¹ As Oda once said:

The right of a state to expel, at will, aliens, whose presence is regarded as undesirable, is, like the right to refuse admission of aliens, considered as an attribute of the sovereignty of the state.²²

16. National laws, international jurisprudence and doctrine are in agreement that this right is not an absolute right of the State.²³ The State resorting to expulsion is bound to invoke the grounds used to justify it.²⁴ Although every State in fact has the right freely to determine the grounds for expelling an alien according to its own criteria, “the right of expulsion still must not be abused”.²⁵ The State’s right to expel aliens therefore falls within the realm of international law.

²¹ In this connection, it is worth noting the marginal opinion of Tchernoff, *Protection des nationaux résidant à l'étranger*, who stated that few persons currently maintain that the right to expel aliens is a normal attribute of a State exercising its civilizing function.

²² “The individual in international law”, p. 482.

²³ See Bluntschli, *Droit internationale codifié*, p. 228, art. 383; Jennings and Watts, *Oppenheim's International Law*, p. 940.

²⁴ See the *Boffolo* case (1903), UNRIIAA, vol. X (Sales No. 1960.V.4), p. 533; see also *Paquet, ibid.*, vol. IX (Sales No. 1959.V.5), p. 323.

²⁵ Oda, *loc. cit.*, p. 482.

¹⁸ See Rewald, “Judicial control of administrative discretion in the expulsion and extradition of aliens”, p. 451.

¹⁹ See Irizarry y Puente, *loc. cit.*, p. 254.

²⁰ Griffin, *loc. cit.*, p. 90.

CHAPTER III

Grounds for expulsion

17. There are always grounds for the expulsion of an alien by a State, whether they are avowed or unavowed. It is agreed that some grounds for expulsion are not contrary to international law. This is generally the case with breaches of “law and order”, “public safety” or “national security”. In fact, any notion as vague as that of law and order sometimes gives rise to many different, often very broad, interpretations, including acts that could not be considered the basis for lawful expulsion.

18. Grounds for expulsion may vary from one country to another. In the United States, for example, the Immigration and Nationality Act, in force in 1965, excluded from entry into American territory aliens having a psychopathic personality or suffering from epilepsy or mental retardation. In two famous cases relating to this Act, *Boutilier v. Immigration and Naturalization Service*²⁶ and

Longstaff,²⁷ the Supreme Court decided to refuse admission to and, furthermore, to order the expulsion of, homosexual aliens on the ground of sexual deviation.

19. A study of a variety of national laws shows an even wider range of grounds for expulsion. For example, expulsion may be motivated by the fact that, among other things, the alien is a threat or a danger to public peace; jeopardizes relations between the country concerned and other States; seeks to foment change in the political order through violent means; espouses doctrines that are either subversive or contrary to the established order; is unemployed, without a fixed abode or without a livelihood; is a criminal or is being prosecuted; or is suffering from an infectious or serious illness, is mentally deficient,

Bogatin, “The Immigration and Nationality Act and the exclusion of homosexuals: *Boutilier v. INS* Revisited”.

²⁷ Petition for Naturalization of Richard John Longstaff, *Federal Reporter*, 2nd ed., vol. 716, p. 1439 (1983).

²⁶ Supreme Court of the United States, District of Columbia, *Federal Reporter*, 2nd ed., vol. 387, p. 118 (1967) and the critical note by

a beggar, a prostitute, an adventurer or an illicit trafficker. Such grounds are found in the law of Latin American countries for the period between 1907 and 1925.²⁸ There is also the expulsion of Roma from several European and Latin American countries; the expulsion of aliens from some countries because of their ideological convictions, in particular during the cold war;²⁹ or the expulsion of various persons, such as homosexuals, because of their sexual behaviour.³⁰

²⁸ Such grounds arise in the law of Brazil (1907), Panama (1914), Chile (1919), Columbia (1920) and the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela (1925) (Irizarry y Puente, *loc. cit.*, p. 256, footnotes 22–34).

²⁹ This refers, in particular, to the expulsion of communists from the United States during the McCarthy era (1950–1954).

³⁰ See Silvers, “The exclusion and expulsion of homosexual aliens”.

20. The international context has evolved and, with it, so have the rules of international law. To a large extent, the rules relating to the protection of fundamental human rights no longer fall within the purview of States and this affects the law applicable to the expulsion of aliens. The question to be answered therefore is which of the many grounds for expelling aliens are admissible under international law, or *a contrario*, which are prohibited. Yet how can this question be answered effectively, when what is admissible or tolerated in one State or region of the world may not necessarily be so elsewhere? The lawful or unlawful nature of grounds for expulsion follows the evolution of international legal standards concerning the protection of human rights. The relevant universal standards must therefore be able to be determined.

CHAPTER IV

Rights related to expulsion

21. The exercise of the right to expel brings into play the rights of the aliens being expelled and those of their State of origin. The rights of expellees vary according to whether a case concerns the expulsion of an individual, collective expulsion or the expulsion of migrant workers.

22. Expulsion of an individual, which is the most commonly practised form, usually involves the rights of an individual. Those rights may derive either from the expelling State’s national legislation or from international human rights law. In that regard, the lawfulness of the expulsion depends on two factors: conformity with the expulsion procedures in force in the expelling State and respect for fundamental human rights.

23. With regard to the expulsion procedure, a logical rule holds that if a State has the right to regulate the conditions for immigration into its territory without thereby infringing any rule of international law, it is also obliged to act in conformity with the rules which it has adopted or to which it has agreed³¹ concerning the expulsion of persons whom it deems that it cannot receive or retain in its territory. In such cases, the State is bound by one of the following adages: *pacta sunt servanda* or *tu patere legem quam ipse fecisti*, or both. This requirement concerning respect for procedures provided for by law may therefore be considered an obligation under general international law and not strictly a treaty obligation or an obligation under domestic law alone. In the absence of a treaty, it might be reasonable to claim that the requirement has a basis in customary law, or to consider it a general legal principle. With regard to personal rights to be respected in cases of expulsion, international law is applicable through both customary and treaty law. The obligations of the territorial State under customary international law apply to all aliens regardless of nationality. They are

grouped around the rather imprecise notion of a “minimum standard”, which is based on the idea that nowadays international law affords aliens a minimum of guarantees, even though it is difficult to specify what they are.³² What is known is that the requirement concerning respect for the dignity of the alien being expelled is one of the standards guaranteed by international law with regard to natural persons. The assets held by the expelled alien in the territory of the expelling State are protected by the relevant rules of international law. However, protection of the alien who has been or is being expelled, as well as his assets, may be enhanced by treaty norms: those contained in international human rights agreements to which the expelling State is a party and those provided for by special agreements relating to the protection of assets and investments drawn up between the expelling State and the alien’s State of origin, where such special agreements exist.

24. With regard to collective expulsion, the principle deriving from international law prohibits it,³³ although it is still practised by some States.³⁴ The question is whether this prohibition is absolute. Despite the brevity of the provisions addressing it, the matter is open to doubt. It might be difficult, for example, to raise this principle to object where a group of nationals of one State jeopardized the safety of, or posed a genuine threat to, a second State in which they were residing and which was engaged in armed conflict with the first State. The Commission must consider whether even in this case it is truly necessary to study the individual situation of each member of such a group if the constituent fact underlying the grounds for expulsion is sufficient to provide a basis for collective expulsion.

³² See Dupuy, *op. cit.*, p. 131.

³³ See article 4 of Protocol No. 4 to the European Convention on Human Rights (freedom of movement and of choice of residence; prohibition of exile, of collective expulsion of aliens and of imprisonment for a civil debt) which entered into force on 2 May 1968.

³⁴ See, for example, the collective expulsion of the Indo-Pakistanis from Uganda under Idi Amin during the 1970s (on this topic, see Twaddle, *Expulsion of a Minority: Essays on Ugandan Asians*; the expulsion of groups of Africans of different nationalities (in particular Beninese and Ghanaians) from Nigeria in the 1980s (Afolayan, “Immigration and expulsion of ECOWAS aliens in Nigeria”); and footnote 6 above, on the case of the collective expulsion of hundreds of Cameroonians from Equatorial Guinea in March 2004.

³¹ See article 13 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights; see also article 31 of the Convention relating to the Status of Stateless Persons; article 22 of the International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families; and at the regional level: article 22, paragraph 6, of the American Convention on Human Rights: “Pact of San José, Costa Rica”; the African Charter of Human and People’s Rights; and article 1 of Protocol No. 7 to the Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms (European Convention on Human Rights).

25. The case of migrant workers falls within a special regime established by the International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Their Families.³⁵ Article 22 of the Convention sets out in considerable detail the conditions for expelling such persons. It prohibits measures of collective expulsion against migrant workers and members of their families and orders that each case of expulsion should be examined and decided individually. The procedure to be followed in cases of expulsion, which is described in minute detail, reinforces the guarantees that protect the rights of expellees, including sheltering them from mere administrative decisions. It guarantees the expellees' right to receive information, to submit arguments against their expulsion and to be compensated if a decision of expulsion that has already been executed is subsequently annulled.

26. In addition, the expulsion of aliens establishes the right of the State of origin to exercise its jurisdiction with respect to the personal protection of its nationals residing outside its borders. In that case, it is authorized by international law to protect its nationals by providing diplomatic protection through judicial or non-judicial means. Diplomatic protection is a separate subject, and the Commission is currently completing a study of it. The Special Rapporteur therefore intends now only to explore the ways in which this institution might be used by an expellee's

³⁵ For a summary of the Convention and the status of ratifications in 1999, see United Nations, *The rights of non-citizens* (E/CN.4/Sub.2/1999/7), paras. 47–49.

State of origin. The *Diallo* case,³⁶ which Guinea brought before ICJ in 1998, showed that the institution of diplomatic protection is not as outmoded as some would hold, but remains in some cases the only means whereby a State may effectively protect the interests of one of its nationals who has been expelled from another State.

27. In that connection, the Special Rapporteur believes that it would be worthwhile to examine all the legal consequences of expulsion within the context of the responsibility of the expelling State and the ensuing compensation due for the injury suffered by the persons who were expelled improperly (rules of procedure) or on grounds contrary to the rules of international law (substantive rules). This of course would not involve studying (again) the general rules concerning the responsibility of States for internationally wrongful acts—it is common knowledge that the Commission completed its work on that question in 2001³⁷—but rather determining how to take advantage of those rules to devise a complete regime under international law relating to the expulsion of aliens. It will no doubt become apparent that for many expellees the major concern is not simply the possibility of compensation, but also enjoyment of the right to return to the countries from which they were improperly expelled. This is entirely different from the cases of people who have been expelled with respect for due process and in conformity with international law.

³⁶ ICJ, *Ahmadou Sadio Diallo (Republic of Guinea v. Democratic Republic of the Congo)*, application instituting proceedings filed on 28 December 1998; pending.

³⁷ *Yearbook ... 2001*, vol. I, pp. 304–305, para. 71.

CHAPTER V

Methodological issues

28. The topic of “the expulsion of aliens” derives from both domestic and international law. In fact, it involves national rules issued by the State in connection with its territorial sovereignty, and rules of international law, either general or specific and treaty-related, concerning the protection of human rights. National practice and the comparative law perspective will play a fundamental role in the identification of rules that the international community could be considered to hold in common and thus to be codifiable as international legal norms. Such national practice would be defined by comparing the available or accessible legislation and legal precedents of most States, as well as of international regional human rights courts. This transnational and comparative approach is all the more appropriate inasmuch as even some national courts take comparative law as the basis for their decisions in cases relating to the expulsion of aliens. Thus, in the *Habeas Corpus de Alfredo Rossi* case,³⁸ for example, the Federal District Court of Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, invoked the laws of several European countries to substantiate the existence of the right to expel an alien on grounds of public and political order:

Considering, that the right to expel an alien, by reason of public and political order, has been exercised, and still is, by all governments;

³⁸ *Revista de Direito*, pp. 536–541, quoted by Irizarry y Puente, *loc. cit.*, p. 258.

and is expressly found in French, Swiss, Danish, Spanish, Dutch and English legislation.³⁹

29. In this connection, the case law of the European Commission of Human Rights, the European Court of Human Rights, the Inter-American Court of Human Rights and the African Commission on Human and Peoples' Rights offers an abundance of rich material that can be mined to extract some hard and fast rules on the subject.

30. There is one question, in particular, on which the Special Rapporteur would like to have the opinion of the members of the Commission, namely how to deal with existing treaty rules on the issue. Should they be taken up again in the draft articles to be drawn up in the future or should those articles be limited to bridging any legal gaps? Should the draft articles be restricted to the formulation of basic principles relative to the expulsion of aliens or, on the contrary, propose an entire legal regime? The Special Rapporteur is inclined to believe that draft articles on this topic would be of interest only if they presented as exhaustive a legal regime as possible, founded on general principles forming the legal basis for the expulsion of aliens under international law. This inclination has led him to propose the draft workplan annexed to this preliminary report (annex I).

³⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 539.

Annex I

DRAFT WORKPLAN

Part One

GENERAL RULES

- I. SCOPE
 - A. Expulsion and related concepts
 - 1. Expulsion and exile
 - 2. Expulsion and population displacement
 - 3. Expulsion and population exodus
 - 4. Expulsion and deportation
 - 5. Expulsion and extradition
 - 6. Expulsion and refoulement at the border
 - 7. Expulsion and non-admission
 - 8. Expulsion and “extrajudicial transfer”
 - 9. Expulsion and “extraordinary transfer”
 - 10. Expulsion and inadmissibility
 - 11. Expulsion and escort to the border
 - B. Definitions
 - 1. Alien
 - 2. Expulsion
 - 3. Expulsion of aliens
 - B. A right to be exercised subject to respect for the fundamental rules of international law
 - 1. Principle of non-expulsion of nationals and stateless persons
 - 2. Principle of respect for fundamental human rights during expulsion proceedings
 - 3. Principle of prohibition of collective expulsion
 - C. Grounds for and lawfulness of expulsion
 - 1. Traditional grounds recognized under international law
 - (a) Public order
 - (b) State security
 - (c) Higher interests of the State?
 - 2. Contingent grounds debatable under international law
 - (a) Religious belief
 - (b) Origin
 - (c) Sexual behaviour
 - (d) Physical and mental condition
 - (e) Other
- II. GENERAL PRINCIPLES
 - A. A right inherent in State sovereignty
 - 1. A customary rule
 - 2. A rule which is not absolute

Part Two

EXPULSION REGIMES

- I. INDIVIDUAL EXPULSION
 - A. Procedure
 - B. Lawfulness
- II. COLLECTIVE EXPULSION
 - A. Principle of prohibition
 - B. Limits of the principle
- III. SPECIFIC CASE OF MIGRANT WORKERS
 - A. Principle of prohibition of collective expulsion
 - B. Conditions for expulsion

Part Three

LEGAL CONSEQUENCES OF EXPULSION

- I. RIGHTS OF EXPELLED PERSONS
 - A. Right to respect for fundamental rights to dignity
 - B. Right to return to the territory of the expelling State
 - C. Right to compensation for any harm suffered
- II. RIGHTS OF THE STATE OF ORIGIN: DIPLOMATIC PROTECTION
 - A. Diplomatic protection through non-judicial means
 - B. Diplomatic protection through judicial means
- III. RESPONSIBILITY OF THE EXPELLING STATE
 - A. The principle
 - B. The implications

PARTIAL BIBLIOGRAPHY

I. Publications and articles

- ABRAHAM, Ronny
 “La reconduite à la frontière des demandeurs d’asile”, *Revue française de droit administratif* (Paris), vol. 8, No. 1, January–February 1992, pp. 90–103.
- ANDRIAMIRADO, Sennen
 “Les ‘Palestiniens’ de l’Afrique de l’Ouest”, *Jeune Afrique Économie*, 3 June 1996, pp. 74–77.
- BARUTCISKI, Michael
 “Chronique de jurisprudence canadienne en droit des réfugiés (1992)—expulsion pour cause de sécurité publique: une protection réduite”, *Documentation Réfugiés* (Paris), Supplement to No. 217, 25 May–7 June 1993.
- BEATTIE JR, Chester S.
 “The 1980 Lei do Estrangeiro: the return of traditional defenses against expulsion in Brazilian immigration law?”, *Texas International Law Journal* (Austin), vol. 18, No. 1, 1983, pp. 151–173.
- BENDERMACHER-GEROUSSIS, Emile and Alexandre BENDERMACHER-GEROUSSIS
 “Le contrôle juridictionnel du pouvoir discrétionnaire dans l’expulsion et l’extradition des étrangers”, *Revue hellénique de droit international* (Athens), vols. 38–39, 1985–1986, pp. 375–388.
- BENOIT ROHMER, Florence
 “Reconduite à la frontière: développements récents”, *Revue du droit public et de la science politique en France et à l’étranger* (Paris), vol. 110, 1994, pp. 429–478.
- BÈS DE BERC, Emmanuel
De l’expulsion des étrangers. Paris, 1888.
- BHABHA, Jacqueline and Geoffrey COLL, eds.
Asylum law and practice in Europe and North America: A comparative analysis by leading experts. Washington, D.C., Federal Publications, 1992. 239 p.
- BØDTCHER, Anne la Cour and Jane HUGHES
 “The effects of legislation imposing fines on airlines for transporting undocumented passengers”, in Morten Kjaerum, ed., *The Effects of Carrier Sanctions on the Asylum System*. Copenhagen, Danish Refugee Council, 1991, pp. 6–13.
- BRUNELLE, Christian
 “La primauté du droit: la situation des immigrants et des réfugiés en droit canadien au regard des chartes et des textes internationaux”, *Les Cahiers de Droit* (Quebec), vol. 28, No. 3, September 1987, pp. 585–624.
- CAMPIGLIO, Cristina
 “Reciprocity in the treatment of aliens in Italy: good reasons for its abolition”, *Italian Yearbook of International Law* (Siena), vol. 11, 2001, pp. 125–137.
- CARLIER, Jean-Yves
 “L’expulsion collective d’étrangers”, in Pierre Lambert and Christophe Pettiti, eds., *Les mesures relatives aux étrangers à l’épreuve de la Convention européenne des droits de l’homme: actes du séminaire du 21 mars 2003 organisé par les Instituts des droits de l’homme du barreau de Bruxelles et du barreau de Paris*. Brussels, Nemesis/Bruylant, 2003, pp. 111–138.
- “Droit des étrangers” (Jurisprudence), *Journal des procès* (Brussels), Nos. 218–219, 29 May and 12 June 1992.
- CHADBOURNE, Julie
Spain—Discretion without bounds: the arbitrary application of Spanish immigration law. Washington, D.C., Human Rights Watch, 2002. 23 p.
- CHALANTON, Paul
La nationalité néerlandaise (Pays-Bas et colonies)—nationalité et service militaire: police des étrangers: admission, expulsion et surveillance des étrangers: extradition: lois traduites et annotées d’après les plus récents documents officiels: avec un appendice et un index alphabétique. The Hague, Boucher, 1928. 134 p.
- CHALTIEL, Florence
 “Le juge administratif, juge de l’immigration”, *Revue du droit public* (Paris), vol. 116, No. 1, January/February 2000, pp. 153–193.
- CHANTRE, Alfred
Du séjour et de l’expulsion des étrangers. Geneva, Aubert-Schuchardt, 1891. 132 p. (Thesis, University of Geneva)
- CHEVALLIER, Jacques
 [French] Constitutional Council, 28 July 1989, decision No. 89–281 DC, *Actualité juridique—Droit administratif*, 1989, pp. 619–627.
- CHOLEWINSKI, Ryszard
 “Strasbourg’s ‘hidden agenda’?: the protection of second-generation migrants from expulsion under article 8 of the European Convention on Human Rights”, *Netherlands Quarterly of Human Rights* (Utrecht), vol. 12, issue 3, 1994, pp. 287–306.
- CLARK, Tom
 “Human rights and expulsion: giving content to the concept of asylum”, *International Journal of Refugee Law* (Oxford), vol. 4, issue 2, 1992, pp. 189–204.
- COSTA-LASCOUX, Jacqueline
 “Les politiques migratoires à l’épreuve des faits”, *Collection of lectures: texts and summaries*. Strasbourg, Institute of Human Rights, 1992. 13 p.
- COSTA-LASCOUX, Jacqueline and Patrick WEIL
Logiques d’États et migrations. Paris, Kimé, 1992.
- CRÉPEAU, François
 “Quel statut pour l’étranger absolu? La condition du demandeur d’asile selon le droit canadien”, *Les réfugiés en France et en Europe—quarante ans d’application de la Convention de Genève 1952–1992: actes du colloque organisé à l’initiative de l’OFPRA, 11–13 juin 1992*. Paris, Office français de protection des réfugiés et des apatrides, 1992.
- “Condition des étrangers—Conseil d’État: 13 décembre 1991 (Préfet de l’Hérault c. Dakouri)”, *Revue critique de droit international privé*, vol. 81, No. 3, July–September 1992.
- Droit d’asile: de l’hospitalité aux contrôles migratoires*. Brussels, Bruylant, 1995. Collection de droit international, 29. 424 p.
- CUGNIN, Robert
L’expulsion des étrangers. Nancy, Crépin-Leblond, 1912. 342 p. (Thesis, University of Nancy, France)
- DARUT, Joseph-André
De l’expulsion des étrangers—principe général: application en France. Aix, B. Niel, 1902. 249 p. (Thesis, University of Aix-Marseille, France)
- DENT, John A.
Research paper on the social and economic rights of non-nationals in Europe. London, European Council on Refugees and Exiles, 1998. 130 p.
- DÉVELOPPEMENTS RÉCENTS EN DROIT DE L’IMMIGRATION (1998)
 Cowansville, Quebec, Yvon Blais, 1998. (Service de la formation permanente, Barreau du Québec)

- DE ZAYAS, Alfred M.
Nemesis at Potsdam—the Anglo-Americans and the expulsion of the Germans: background, execution, consequences. 2nd rev. ed. London, Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1979. 268 p.
- DJIK, P. van
 Protection of ‘integrated’ aliens against expulsion under the European Convention on Human Rights, in Elspeth Guild and Paul Minderhoud, eds., *Security of Residence and Expulsion: Protection of Aliens in Europe*. The Hague, Kluwer, 2001, pp. 23–39.
- DOCKX, Véronique
 “L’accès au territoire, la détention et l’expulsion des mineurs étrangers non accompagnés à la lumière de la loi sur la tutelle”, *Revue du droit des étrangers* (Brussels), issue 128, 2004, pp. 167–181.
- DONAHUE, Bill
 “Life in Limbostan: stranded in a Spanish outpost in Africa, illegal immigrants from around the globe await the blessing of expulsion”, *Mother Jones*, vol. 28, issue 5, September–October 2003.
- ECONOMIST
 “War with Milosevic: a widening conflict”. *Kosovo Special*, London, 10 April 1999, pp. 19–21.
- ETZWILER, Nancy G.
 “Le traitement des demandeurs d’asile aux ports d’entrée et le concept de ‘zones internationales’”. Paris, Association nationale d’assistance aux frontières pour les étrangers, April 1992. 18 p. Document présenté au colloque sur le statut juridique de la zone internationale, 10–11 April 1992.
- EVANS, A. C.
 “United Kingdom courts and European Community law governing the exclusion or expulsion of migrants”, *Public Law* (London), winter 1981, pp. 497–510.
- FABRE-ALIBERT, Véronique
 “Réflexions sur le nouveau régime juridique des étrangers en France”, *Chronique administrative, Revue du droit public et de la science politique en France et à l’étranger*, vol. 110, July–August 1994, pp. 1165–1195.
- FATHOLAHZADEH, Ardavan and Louis TINTI
 “Luxembourg”, in Bruno Nascimbene, ed., *Expulsion and Detention of Aliens in the European Union Countries*. Milan, Giuffrè, 2001, pp. 377–412.
- FAVOREU, L.
 “La jurisprudence du Conseil constitutionnel en 1980”, *Revue du droit public et de la science politique en France et à l’étranger*, No. 6, November–December 1980, pp. 1627–1698.
- FERNANDEZ-KELLY, Patricia M.
 “Rethinking citizenship in the Global Village: reflections on immigrants and the underclass”. Paper presented at the Conference on gender issues and refugees: development implications, York University, Toronto, Canada, 9–11 May 1993, vol. 1, pp. 386–438.
- FITZPATRICK, Joan
 “The post-exclusion phase: extradition, prosecution and expulsion”, *International Journal of Refugee Law* (Oxford), vol. 12, winter 2000, pp. 272–292.
- FORDHAM INTERNATIONAL LAW JOURNAL (New York)
 “State responsibility for constructive wrongful expulsion of foreign nationals”, vol. 11, summer 1988, pp. 802–838.
- FORDHAM LAW REVIEW (New York)
 “Deportation: procedural rights of re-entering permanent resident aliens subjected to exclusion hearings”, vol. 51, May 1983, pp. 1339–1359.
- FRELICK, Bill
 “Haitian boat interdiction and return: first asylum and first principles of refugee protection”, *Cornell International Law Journal* (Ithaca, New York), vol. 26, 1993, pp. 675–694.
- GENEVOIS, Bruno
 “La compétence constitutionnelle du juge administratif et la police des étrangers: à propos de la décision du Conseil constitutionnel No. 89–261 DC du 28 juillet 1989”, *Revue française de droit administratif* (Paris), vol. 5, No. 4, July–August 1989, p. 691–702.
 “L’entrée des étrangers en France: le rappel des exigences constitutionnelles”, *Revue française de droit administratif* (Paris), vol. 8, No. 2, 1992, pp. 185–201.
 A constitutional status for foreigners: apropos the [French] Constitutional Council’s decision No. 93–325 DC of 13 August 1993. *Revue française de droit administratif* (Paris), vol. 9, No. 5, September–October 1993, pp. 871–900.
- GOODWIN-GILL, Guy S.
International Law and the Movement of Persons between States. Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1978. 324 p.
 “The Haitian *refoulement* case: a comment”, *International Journal of Refugee Law* (Oxford), vol. 6, No. 1, 1994, pp. 103–109.
- GRABLE, David M.
 “Personhood under the due process clause: a constitutional analysis of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996”, *Cornell Law Review* (Ithaca, New York), vol. 83, No. 3, March 1998, pp. 820–865.
- GROENENDIJK, Kees
 “Long-term immigrants and the Council of Europe”, in Elspeth Guild and Paul Minderhoud, eds., *Security of Residence and Expulsion: Protection of Aliens in Europe*. The Hague, Kluwer, 2001, pp. 7–22.
- GUILD, Elspeth
 “Security of residence and expulsion of foreigners: European Community law”, in Elspeth Guild and Paul Minderhoud, eds., *Security of Residence and Expulsion: Protection of Aliens in Europe*. The Hague, Kluwer, 2001, pp. 59–80.
- GUILD, Elspeth and Paul MINDERHOUD, eds.
Security of Residence and Expulsion: Protection of Aliens in Europe. The Hague, Kluwer, 2001. 249 p.
- GUIMEZANES, Nicole
 “La nouvelle loi sur l’entrée et le séjour des étrangers en France (loi No. 89–548 du 2 août 1989)”. *La Semaine juridique: Juris-Classeur Périodique*, No. 64, 1990, p. 3424.
- HAGUE ACADEMY OF INTERNATIONAL LAW
The right of asylum. Dordrecht, Martinus Nijhoff, 1990. 121 p. (Centre for Studies and Research in International Law and International Relations)
- HAILBRONNER, K.
 “Expulsion of aliens from the Federal Republic of Germany”, in R. Bernhardt and U. Beyerling, eds., *Reports on German Public Law and Public International Law*. Heidelberg, C. F. Muller, 1986, pp. 97–113.
- HANNUM, Hurst
The Right to Leave and Return in International Law and Practice. Dordrecht, Martinus Nijhoff, 1987. 189 p. (International Studies in Human Rights, 8)
- HARTMANN, Rainer
 “Yemeni exodus from Saudi-Arabia: the Gulf conflict and the ceasing of the workers’ emigration”, *Journal of South Asian and Middle Eastern Studies*, vol. 19, No. 2, 1995, pp. 38–52.
- HARVEY, Colin
 “Expulsion, national security and the European Convention”, *European Law Review* (London), vol. 22, No. 6, December 1997, pp. 626–633.

- "Promoting insecurity: public order, expulsion and the European Convention on Human Rights", in Elspeth Guild and Paul Minderhoud, eds., *Security of Residence and Expulsion: Protection of Aliens in Europe*. The Hague, Kluwer, 2001, pp. 41–57.
- HELTON, Arthur C.
 "The Malaysian policy to redirect Vietnamese boat people: non-refoulement as a human rights remedy", *New York University Journal of International Law and Politics*, vol. 24, 1992, pp. 1203–1217.
- HENCKAERTS, Jean-Marie
 "The current status and content of the prohibition of mass expulsion of aliens", *Human Rights Law Journal*, vol. 15, issue 8–10, 1994, pp. 301–317.
Mass Expulsion in Modern International Law and Practice. The Hague, Martinus Nijhoff, 1995. 257 p.
- HOLLIFIELD, James F.
 "Migration and international relations: cooperation and control in the European Community", *International Migration Review* (New York), vol. 26, No. 2, summer 1992, pp. 568–595.
- HOTOP, S. D.
 "Judicial control of administrative discretion in the expulsion and extradition of aliens", in A. E. S. Tay, ed., *Law and Australian Legal Thinking in the 1980s*. Sydney, 1986, pp. 551–576. (Collection of the Australian contributions to the 12th International Congress of Comparative Law)
- JACQUES, André
Les Déracinés. Paris, Ed. La Découverte, 1985. 240 p.
- JAEGER, Gilbert
 Irregular movements: the concept and possible solutions", *The new asylum seekers—refugee law in the 1980s: the ninth Sokol colloquium on international law*. 1988, pp. 23–48. (International Studies in Human Rights)
- JULIEN-LAFFERRIÈRE, François
 "Le traitement des réfugiés et des demandeurs d'asile au point d'entrée", *Revue Universelle des Droits de l'Homme*, vol. 2, No. 2, 28 February 1990, pp. 53–58.
Frontières du droit, frontières des droits: l'introuvable statut de la zone internationale. Paris, L'Harmattan/ANAFE, 1993. 237 p.
 "Le mythe de 'l'immigration zéro'", *L'actualité juridique: Droit administratif*, vol. 50, 1994, pp. 83–95.
- KARAGIANNIS, Syméon
 "Expulsion des étrangers et mauvais traitements imputables à l'État de destination ou à des particuliers: vers une évolution de la jurisprudence européenne?", *Revue Trimestrielle des Droits de l'Homme* (Brussels), vol. 10, No. 37, 1999, pp. 33–88.
- KIDD, John
 "Extradition and expulsion orders and the European Convention on Human Rights: the Soering decision and beyond", *Bracton Law Journal* (Exeter), vol. 26, 1994, pp. 67 *et seq.*
- KOPROLIN, Eva
 "Introduction", in Elspeth Guild and Paul Minderhoud, eds., *Security of Residence and Expulsion: Protection of Aliens in Europe*. The Hague, Kluwer, 2001, pp. 3–6.
- LABAYLE, Henri
 "Le contrôle contentieux des 'expulsions dirigées' ou les prolongements de la jurisprudence *Bozano* au Palais-Royal. *Revue française de droit administratif* (Paris), vol. 5, No. 1, January–February 1989, pp. 3–45.
- LALOUPO, Francis, ed.
 "Un monde sans pitié!", *Le Nouvel Afrique Asie* (Paris), October 1996, pp. 10–15.
- LEBULLENGER, Joël
 "À propos de l'expulsion des étrangers: les garanties de procédure administrative en droits français et communautaire", *Revue critique de droit international privé* (Paris), vol. 70, No. 3, July–September 1981, pp. 447–488.
- LEIN, Yehezkel, Ofir FEUERSTEIN and Yael STEIN
Nu'man, East Jerusalem: life under the threat of expulsion. Talpiot, Jerusalem, B'tselem, 2003. 33 p. (Duah matsav (Be-tselem (Organization: Jerusalem)), September 2003)
- LE POINT
 "Zaire: le grand K.-O" (Paris), 29 July 1995, pp. 32–37.
- LOCHAK, Danièle
Étrangers: de quel droit? 1st ed. Paris, Presses Universitaires de France, 1985. 256 p. (Politique d'aujourd'hui)
 "L'entrée et le séjour des étrangers en France: une législation sous influence". *L'actualité Juridique: Droit Administratif*, vol. 45, 1989, pp. 586–597.
- LUCHAIRE, François
 "Le Conseil constitutionnel et la loi du 24 avril 1997 sur l'immigration", *Revue du droit public et de la science politique en France et à l'étranger* (Paris), vol. 113, No. 2, July–August 1997, pp. 931–964.
- LYON-CAEN, Antoine
 "Étranger, immigré, immigrant: question de définition". *Revue de droit sanitaire et social* (Paris), vol. 23, No. 2, April–June 1987, pp. 189–196.
- MADUREIRA, Joao
Aliens' admission to and departure from national territory—case-law of the organs of the European Convention on Human Rights and the European Social Charter: Background document for the colloquy "Human Rights without Frontiers", Strasbourg, France, 30 November–1 December 1989. Strasbourg, Council of Europe, 1989. 50 p.
- MAGISTRO, John V.
 "Crossing over: ethnicity and transboundary conflict in the Senegal River valley", *Cahiers d'Études africaines* (Paris), vol. XXXIII–2, 1993, pp. 201–232.
- MALABRE, Jean Eric
 "Security of residence and expulsion—protection of aliens in Europe: the French experience", in Elspeth Guild and Paul Minderhoud, eds., *Security of Residence and Expulsion: Protection of Aliens in Europe*. The Hague, Kluwer, 2001, pp. 125–137.
- MARSH, A. H.
 "Colonial expulsion of aliens: an answer", *American Law Review* (St. Louis), vol. XXXIII, 1899, pp. 246–253.
- MARTIN, Scott M.
 "Non-refoulement of refugees: United States compliance with international obligations", *Harvard International Law Journal*, vol. 23, Winter 1983, pp. 357–380.
- MARTINI, Alexis
L'expulsion des étrangers. Paris, Larose & Tenin, 1909. 269 p.
- MASCLET, Jean-Claude
 "Les politiques d'immigration dans la Communauté", *Revue politique et parlementaire* (Paris), No. 947, May–June 1990, pp. 59–79.
- MIDDLE EAST REPORTER WEEKLY
 "Egypt, Sudan calm about Libya expelling workers", vol. 77, 16 September 1995, pp. 15–16.
 "Controversy over JRA deportation", vol. 94, No. 1090, 25 March 2000, pp. 15–17.
- MILES, Robert
 "L'Europe de 1993: l'État, l'immigration et la restructuration de l'exclusion", *Sociologie et sociétés*, vol. XXIV, No. 2, autumn 1992, pp. 45–57.

MINNESOTA LAW REVIEW

"Constitutional restraints on the expulsion and exclusion of aliens", vol. XXXVII, 1952–1953, pp. 440–458.

MODEEN, Tore and Matti PELLONPÄÄ

Judicial control of administrative discretion in the expulsion and extradition of aliens. Helsinki, Yliopistopaino, 1986. 29 p. (Paper presented at the XIIth International Congress of Comparative Law, Australia, 18–27 August 1986)

MORRIS, Maria V.

"The exit fiction: unconstitutional indefinite detention of deportable aliens", *Houston Journal of International Law*, vol. 23, No. 2, winter 2001, pp. 255–304.

NASCIMBENE, Bruno, ed.

Expulsion and detention of aliens in the European Union countries. Milan, Giuffrè, 2001. 602 p.

NGUYEN VAN YEN, Christian

Droit de l'immigration. Paris, Presses Universitaires de France, 1986. 352 p.

NOVICKI, Margaret A.

"West Africa after the exodus", *Africa Report*, vol. 30, July–August 1985, pp. 10–13.

PACURAR, Andi

"Smuggling, detention and expulsion of irregular migrants: a study on international legal norms, standards and practices", *European Journal of Migration and Law*, vol. 5, No. 2, 2003, pp. 259–283.

PEAUCELLE, Jean-Christophe

"L'immigration et la libre circulation des personnes en Europe: enjeux et perspectives", *Revue française de droit administratif* (Paris), vol. 6, No. 4, July–August 1990, pp. 516–524.

PELLONPÄÄ, Matti

Expulsion in international law: a study in international aliens law and human rights with special reference to Finland. Helsinki, Suomalainen tiedeakatemia, 1984. 508 p. (Dissertationes humanarum litterarum, 39)

"Judicial control of administrative discretion in the expulsion and extradition of aliens", in K. Buure-Haglund, ed., *The Finnish national reports to the Twelfth Congress of the International Academy of Comparative Law.* Helsinki, Institutum Iurisprudentiae Comparativae Universitatis Helsingiensis, 1986, pp. 133–171.

PERRUCHOUD, Richard

"L'expulsion en masse d'étrangers", *AFDI*, vol. XXXIV, 1988, pp. 677–693.

L'expulsion en masse d'étrangers: étude de droit international. Geneva, Independent Commission on International Humanitarian Issues.

PILLING, Mark

"Airlines foot bill for illegal entry", *Interavia*, vol. 47, No. 9, September 1992, pp. 70–71.

PLENDER, Richard

International Migration Law. 2nd rev. ed. Dordrecht, Martinus Nijhoff, 1988. 587 p.

"Competence, European Community law and nationals of non-member States", *International and Comparative Law Quarterly* (Cambridge), vol. 39, 1990, pp. 599–610.

PUÉCHAVY, Michel

"Le renvoi des étrangers à l'épreuve de la Convention européenne des droits de l'homme", in Pierre Lambert and Christophe Pettiti, eds., *Les mesures relatives aux étrangers à l'épreuve de la Convention européenne des droits de l'homme: actes du séminaire du 21 mars 2003.* Brussels, Bruylant, 2003, pp. 75–95.

RICCA, Sergio

Migrations internationales en Afrique: aspects légaux et administratifs. Paris, L'Harmattan, 1990. 280 p.

RICCI, Marco

"A legislative outline of Italian regulations governing foreigners: regulations in force and new proposals", *Italy, Documents and Notes*, vol. 34, October–December 1985, pp. 15–31. English translation by Euan Cecil Wright.

ROGERS, Andrea

"Exploitation v. expulsion: the use of expedited removal in asylum cases as an answer to a compromised system", *William Mitchell Law Review* (St. Paul, Minnesota), vol. 24, No. 3, 1998, pp. 785–821.

RONDEPIERRE, Jean

Statut des étrangers—entrée, séjour, expulsion, naturalisation, cartes de travailleur et de commerçant, obligations des employeurs: textes, commentaires, jurisprudence, conventions internationales. Paris, Imprimerie administrative centrale, 1953. 190 p.

RUPNIK, Jacques and Anne BAZIN

"The difficult reconciliation between Germany and the Czech Republic". *Politique étrangère*, vol. 66, No. 2, April–June 2001, pp. 353–370.

SIEVEKING, Klaus

"Security of residence and expulsion: the German experience", in Elspeth Guild and Paul Minderhoud, eds., *Security of Residence and Expulsion: Protection of Aliens in Europe.* The Hague, Kluwer, 2001, pp. 105–123.

STENBERG, Gunnel

Non-expulsion and non-refoulement: the prohibition against removal of refugees with special references to articles 32 and 33 of the 1951 Convention relating to the status of refugees. Uppsala, Iustus Förlag, 1989. 309 p. (Thesis, University of Uppsala, Sweden)

SWINDELL, Kenneth

"International labour migration in Nigeria 1976–1986: employment, nationality and ethnicity", *Migration*, No. 8, 1990, pp. 135–155.

TEITGEN-COLLY, Catherine

"Le droit d'asile: la fin des illusions", *L'Actualité Juridique: Droit Administratif* (Paris), vol. 50, February 1994, pp. 97–114.

TEITGEN-COLLY, Catherine and François JULIEN-LAFERRIÈRE

"Chronique de législation: étrangers", *L'Actualité Juridique: Droit Administratif* (Paris), No. 11, 20 November 1998, pp. 922–930.

THAYER, Nate

"Hostile home: Vietnamese fear expulsion under new law", *Far Eastern Economic Review*, 13 October 1994, pp. 20–21.

TÓTH, Judith

"Security of residence and expulsion: protection of aliens in Hungary", in Elspeth Guild and Paul Minderhoud, eds., *Security of Residence and Expulsion: Protection of Aliens in Europe.* The Hague, Kluwer, 2001, pp. 165–174.

TURPIN, Dominique

"La réforme de l'ordonnance du 2 novembre 1945 sur la condition des étrangers par la loi du 10 janvier 1980", *Revue critique de droit international privé* (Paris), vol. 69, 1980, pp. 41–57.

"Les nouvelles conditions de l'expulsion des étrangers", *Revue française de droit administratif* (Paris), vol. 2, No. 2, March–April 1986, pp. 137–154.

"La réforme de la condition des étrangers par les lois des 24 août et 30 décembre 1993 et par la loi constitutionnelle du 25 novembre 1993", *Revue critique de droit international privé* (Paris), vol. 83, 1994, pp. 1–61.

TURPIN, Dominique, ed.

Immigrés et réfugiés dans les démocraties occidentales: défis et solutions. Paris, Economica, 1989. 319 p.

VIGROUX-ECHEGUT, Muriel

“Le contrôle de la qualification juridique des faits dans le contentieux de l’expulsion des étrangers”, *Revue Trimestrielle des Droits de l’Homme* (Brussels), vol. 11, issue 43, 2000, pp. 479–502.

VINCENT, J.-Y.

“La réforme de l’expulsion des étrangers par la loi du 29 octobre 1981”, *Semaine Juridique*, general ed., part I (doctrine), 1982, p. 3054.

WILSHER, Daniel

“The administrative detention of non-nationals pursuant to immigration control: international and constitutional law perspectives”, *International and Comparative Law Quarterly* (Cambridge), vol. 53, No. 4, October 2004, pp. 897–934.

WHITE, Robin C. A.

“Procedural guarantees and expulsion”, *European Law Review* (London), vol. 21, June 1996, pp. 241–246.

WOODS, Lorna

“Consequences of TRNC—expulsion of Greek Cypriots, article 8: home right to culture, article 1 of Protocol 1: treatment of remaining Greek Cypriots and Cypriot Gypsies, article 2: right to life, missing persons, access to medical treatment, article 3, article 5: lack of education”, *British Year Book of International Law*, 2001, vol. 72, pp. 493–504.

“Right to receive medical treatment—inhuman and degrading treatment, expulsion of aliens, article 3, mental health, private life, article 8, judicial review, effective remedy, article 13”, *British Year Book of International Law*, 2001, vol. 72, pp. 513–516.

II. International documents

A. EUROPEAN ORGANIZATIONS

European Community (Commission). Communication from the Commission to the Council and the European Parliament on immigration and asylum policies, 23 February 1994 (COM (94) 23 final). 94 p.

European Community (Council). Press release on the meeting of ministers responsible for immigration, 2 June 1993, No. 6712/93 (Presse 90). 6 p.

European Community (Council). Declaration on principles of governing external aspects of migration policy, European Council in Edinburgh, 11–12 December 1992, SN 456/92.

European Community (European Parliament). Report on a European Migration Policy (Van den Brink report), 2 October 1992. 27 p. See resolution on European immigration policy (A3–0280/92), *Official Journal of the European Communities*, No. C 377, vol. 35, 21 December 1992.

Council of Europe. Ad Hoc Committee of Experts on the Legal Aspects of Territorial Asylum, Refugees and Stateless Persons (CAHAR)—Compatibility of carrier sanctions in four community States with international civil aviation and human rights obligations: a report by A. Cruz (Consultant) (CAHAR (90) 7), Strasbourg, 23 November 1990. 22 p.

Council of Europe. Report on the exodus of Albanian nationals (Böhm report), 1992 (document 6555). 12 p.

Council of Europe. Report on migratory flows in Czechoslovakia, Hungary and Poland (Guirado report), 1992 (document 6633). 15 p. See recommendation 1188 (1992) on migratory flows in Czechoslovakia, Hungary and Poland. Parliamentary Assembly, 1992 (REC.1188). 3 p.

Council of Europe. Report on clandestine migration: traffickers and employers of clandestine migrants (Pahtas report), 1993 (document 6817). 24 p.

Protocol No. 4 to the Convention of 4 November 1950 for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, securing certain rights and freedoms other than those already included in the Convention and in the first Protocol thereto

Protocol No. 11 to the Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms of 4 November 1950, restructuring the control machinery established thereby

B. INTERGOVERNMENTAL CONSULTATIONS ON ASYLUM, REFUGEE AND MIGRATION POLICIES IN EUROPE, NORTH AMERICA AND AUSTRALIA

Orientation of multilateral cooperation. Full round consultations. Niagara-on-the-Lake, 29–30 June 1992 (document No. 07/92).

Removal policies with respect to infected asylum-seekers. Full round consultations. Niagara-on-the-Lake, 29–30 June 1992.

Development of information exchange. Full round consultations. Niagara-on-the-Lake, 29–30 June 1992.

Country of origin information (focal points). Full round consultations. Niagara-on-the-Lake, 29–30 June 1992 (document No. 6/Add/92). 21 p.

Background to assessment approach. Full round consultations. Niagara-on-the-Lake, 29–30 June 1992 (document No. 07/92).

Statistical tables (document No. 08/92).

Report of the Country Assessment Approach on Ghana. Full round consultations. Niagara-on-the-Lake, 27 June–1 July 1992. 23 p.

C. AD HOC GROUP ON IMMIGRATION

Report from the Ministers responsible for immigration to the European Council meeting in Maastricht on immigration and asylum policy (Brussels, 3 December 1991) (SN 4376/91, WGI 930). 15 p. Reproduced in Elspeth Guild and Jan Niessen, eds., *The Developing Immigration and Asylum Policies of the European Union: Adopted Conventions, Resolutions, Recommendations, Decisions and Conclusions*. The Hague, Kluwer, 1996, pp. 449–492.

Recommendation regarding practices followed by Member States on expulsion (16 November 1992) (SN 4678/92, WGI 1266). 11 p. *Ibid.*, pp. 219–238.

Recommendation concerning checks on and expulsion of third-country nationals residing or working without authorization (Brussels, 25 May 1993) (SN 3017/93, WGI 1516). 6 p. *Ibid.*, pp. 275–292.

D. OFFICE OF THE UNITED NATIONS HIGH COMMISSIONER FOR REFUGEES

“Position du HCR concernant les résolutions adoptées le 30 novembre 1992 par les ministres des États membres des communautés européennes responsables de l’immigration sur les demandes d’asile manifestement infondées, les pays d’accueil et les pays où il n’y a en règle générale aucun risque grave de persécution”, *Documentation-Réfugiés*, No. 212, 16–29 March 1993, annex II, p. 12.

“The Haitian interdiction case 1993: brief *amicus curiae*”, *International Journal of Refugee Law*, vol. 6, No. 1, 1994, pp. 85–102.

“Position du Haut Commissariat des Nations Unies pour les réfugiés sur le projet de loi relatif à la maîtrise de l’immigration et aux conditions d’entrée et de séjour des étrangers en France”, *Documentation-Réfugiés*, No. 220, 6–19 July 1993, annex, p. 12.

E. ORGANIZATION FOR ECONOMIC COOPERATION AND DEVELOPMENT

Trends in International Migration. Report of the Continuous Reporting System on Migration (SOPEMI). Paris, OECD, 1992. 157 p.

F. ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL OF THE UNITED NATIONS

Commission on Human Rights. Question of the violation of human rights and fundamental freedoms in any part of the world, with particular reference to colonial and other dependent countries and territories. Study on human rights and massive exoduses, by Sadruddin Aga Khan, Special Rapporteur (E/CN.4/1503 of 31 December 1981).

Commission on Human Rights. Comprehensive examination of thematic issues relating to the elimination of racial discrimination. "The rights of non-citizens", working paper submitted by Mr. David Weissbrodt in accordance with Sub-Commission decision 1998/103 (E/CN.4/Sub.2/1999/7 of 31 May 1999).

International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. Human Rights Committee. Consideration of reports submitted by States parties under article 40 of the Covenant: United States of America (CCPR/C/81/Add. 4 of 24 August 1994).

International Provisions Protecting the Human Rights of Non-Citizens. Study prepared by the Baroness Elles, Special Rapporteur of the Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities (E/CN.4/Sub.2/392/Rev.1). United Nations publications, Sales No. E.80.XIV.2.

III. National texts

A. FRANCE

Ordonnance du 2 novembre 1945 relative aux conditions d'entrée et de séjour des étrangers en France consolidée, modifiée et complétée par la loi n° 2003-1119 du 26 novembre 2003 relative à la maîtrise de l'immigration, au séjour des étrangers en France et à la nationalité.

Arrêté du 26 février 2004 du Ministre de l'intérieur, de la sécurité et des libertés locales ordonnant l'expulsion de M. Bouziane du territoire français.

G. AMNESTY INTERNATIONAL

Australia-Pacific—offending human dignity: the "Pacific Solution", www.amnesty.org, index ASA 12/009/2002.

United Nations Committee's recommendations to Lebanon: need for effective measures to protect the human rights of Palestinian refugees, www.amnesty.org, index ACT 79/003/2004.

Cambodia: refugee protection in crisis, www.amnesty.org, index ASA 23/003/2004.

France: deaths during forcible deportation. Concerns in Europe and Central Asia: June 2003, www.amnesty.org, index EUR 01/016/2003.

Bali Ministerial Conference on People Smuggling, Trafficking in Persons and Trans-national Crime must address human rights concerns, www.amnesty.org, index IOR 40/005/2003.

Libya: imminent deportation of Eritrean army deserters, www.amnesty.org, index MDE 19/018/2003.

Iraq: compulsory return must not be imposed on Iraqi asylum seekers, www.amnesty.org, index MDE 14/126/2003.

Iran: hundreds of Afghan refugees forcibly removed from Iran, www.amnesty.org, index MDE 13/006/2000.

Sudan—civilians still under threat in Darfur: an agenda for human rights protection, www.amnesty.org, index AFR 54/131/2004.

H. ORGANIZATION OF AMERICAN STATES

Inter-American Commission on Human Rights, Progress report on the situation of migrant workers and their families in the hemisphere, www.cidh.org, OEA/Ser.L/V/II.102, 16 April 1999.

IV. Jurisprudence

A. EUROPEAN COURT OF HUMAN RIGHTS

Application No. 51564/99, 5 February 2002, *Čonka v. Belgium*: nationals of Slovakian Roma origin arrested in view of their expulsion even though they had been summoned by the police to go through certain formalities (violation of articles 5, paragraph 4, and 13 of the Convention and of article 4 of its Protocol No. 4).

Application No. 50963/99, 20 June 2002, *Al-Nashif v. Bulgaria*: impossibility of contesting the lawfulness of detention while awaiting an expulsion order (violation of article 5, paragraph 4, of the Convention): expulsion separating a family (violation of article 8); absence of any effective recourse procedure (violation of article 13).

Application 56811/00, 11 July 2002, *Amrollahi v. Denmark*: alien risking separation from his spouse and children because of the expulsion order taken out against him after a conviction (violation of article 8 of the Convention).

Application No. 37295/97, 31 October 2002, *Yildiz v. Austria*: expulsion of an alien following his conviction and subsequent separation from his spouse and child (violation of article 8 of the Convention).

Applications Nos. 57374/00 and 57575/00, 8 November 2002, *Sulejmanovic and others and Sejdic and Sulejmanovic v. Italy*:

expulsion of Roma families to Bosnia-Herzegovina (violation of articles 3 and 13 of the Convention, and article 4 of its Protocol No. 4—friendly settlement).

Application No. 36757/97, 6 February 2003, *Jakupovic v. Austria*: deportation of a 16-year-old to Bosnia-Herzegovina where he had no family (violation of article 8 of the European Convention on Human Rights).

Application No. 53470/99, 10 April 2003, *Mehemi v. France*: time taken to authorize return of an alien following the Court's conclusion that the expulsion had violated article 8 and refusal to lift the banning order (art. 8). No violation.

Application No. 52853/99, 17 April 2003, *Yilmaz v. Germany*: expulsion of a second-generation immigrant (violation of article 8 of the Convention).

Application No. 53441/99, 10 July 2003, *Benhebba v. France*: expulsion of an alien after a long period of residence (violation of article 6 of the Convention).

Application No. 52206/99, 15 July 2003, *Mokrani v. France*: threat of expulsion of a second-generation immigrant (violation of article 8 of the Convention).

B. CAMEROON

Loi n° 97/012 du 10 janvier 1997, fixant les conditions d'entrée, de séjour et de sortie des étrangers au Cameroun.

Décret n° 2002/003 du 4 janvier 2002 portant organisation de la Délégation Générale à la Sécurité Nationale.

Application No. 56132/00, 23 July 2003, *Taskin v. Germany*: foreign national risking separation from her family because of her expulsion (art. 8 of the Convention, case struck out).

Application No. 40226/98, 29 July 2003, *Cervenakova and others v. The Czech Republic*: eviction of Slovakian nationals from their homes (violation of articles 3 and 8 of the Convention).

Application No. 48321/99, 9 October 2003 (Grand Chamber), *Slivenko v. Latvia*: deportation, in the context of the withdrawal of Russian troops, of the former military officer, his wife and daughter who had always lived in Latvia (violation of articles 1 and 6 of the Convention).

B. INTER-AMERICAN COMMISSION ON HUMAN RIGHTS

Report No. 6/02, petition 12.071, 27 February 2002: 120 Cuban nationals and 8 Haitian nationals detained in the Bahamas. Admissibility.

Report No. 07/02, petition 11.661, 27 February 2002, *Manickavasagam Suresh v. Canada*. Admissibility.

Report No. 51/01, case 9903, 4 April 2001, *Rafael Ferrer-Mazorra et al. v. United States*.

C. AFRICAN COMMISSION ON HUMAN AND PEOPLES' RIGHTS

Communication 71/92, *Rencontre Africaine pour la Défense des Droits de l'Homme v. Zambia*, 20th Ordinary Session, October 1997, Grand Bay, Mauritius.

Communication 212/98, *Amnesty International v. Zambia*, 25th Ordinary Session, 5 May 1999, Bujumbura.

Communication 73/93, *Mohammed Lamine Diakité v. Gabon*, 27th Ordinary Session, 11 May 2000, Algiers.

Communication 133/94, *Association for the Defence of Human Rights and Freedoms v. Djibouti*, 27th Ordinary Session, 11 May 2000, Algiers.

Communication 219/98, *Legal Defence Centre v. Gambia*, 11 May 2000, Algiers.

Communication 97/93, *John K. Modise v. Botswana*, 28th Ordinary Session, 23 October–6 November 2000, Cotonou.

Communication 239/2001, *Interights* (on behalf of José Domingos Sikunda) v. *Namibia*, 31st Ordinary Session, 2–16 May 2002, Pretoria.

Communication 233/99, *Interights* (on behalf of Pan African Movement and Citizens for Peace in Eritrea) v. *Ethiopia*, 33rd Ordinary Session, 15–29 May 2003, Niamey.

Communication 234/99, *Interights* (on behalf of Pan African Movement and Inter Africa Group) v. *Eritrea*, 33rd Ordinary Session, 15–29 May 2003, Niamey.

D. UNITED NATIONS

UNRIIAA, vol. X, Mixed Claims Commission Italy-Venezuela constituted under the Protocols of 13 February and 7 May 1903, *Boffolo* case (United Nations publication, Sales No. 60.V.4).

Human Rights Committee

Communication No. 34/1978, *Jorge Landinelli Silva et al. v. Uruguay*, 8 April 1981, *Selected Decisions under the Optional Protocol (second to sixteenth session)*, United Nations publication, Sales No. E.84.XIV.2, p. 65.

Communication No. 193/1985, *Pierre Giry v. Dominican Republic*: expulsion of the victim to a third country by the State party's authorities even though he was in transit on its territory. Adoption of views: 20 July 1990. *Official Records of the General Assembly, Forty-fifth Session, Supplement No. 40 (A/45/40)*, Report of the Human Rights Committee, vol. II, annex IX, p. 38.

Communication No. 236/1987, *V. M. R. B. v. Canada*: refusal to comply with deportation order enforcing Canadian immigration law. Decision of 18 July 1988: inadmissibility. *Ibid.*, *Forty-third Session, Supplement No. 40 (A/43/40)*, Report of the Human Rights Committee, annex VIII, sect. F, p. 258.

Communication No. 296/1988, *J. R. C. v. Costa Rica*: expulsion from Costa Rica of a stateless person. Decision on admissibility: 30 March 1989. *Ibid.*, *Forty-fourth Session, Supplement No. 40 (A/44/40)*, Report of the Human Rights Committee, annex XI, p. 293.

Communication No. 291/1988, *Mario I. Torres v. Finland*: detention of the author in accordance with the law on aliens while awaiting his extradition to his country of origin. *Ibid.*, *Forty-fifth Session, Supplement No. 40 (A/45/40)*, Report of the Human Rights Committee, vol. II, annex IX, p. 96.

Communication No. 743/1997: *Truong v. Canada* (Decision adopted on 28 March 2003). *Ibid.*, *Fifty-eighth Session, Supplement No. 40 (A/58/40)*, Report of the Human Rights Committee, vol. II, annex VI, sect. B, p. 397.

Communication No. 829/1998: *Judge v. Canada* (Views adopted on 5 August 2003). *Ibid.*, annex V, sect. G, p. 76.

Communication No. 1011/2001, *Madafferi v. Australia* (CCPR/C/81/D/1011/2001 of 26 August 2004). *Ibid.*, *Forty-ninth Session, Supplement No. 40 (A/59/40)*, Report of the Human Rights Committee, vol. II, annex IX, sect. Y, p. 208.

Communication No. 1069/2002: *Bakhtiyari v. Australia* (Views adopted on 29 October 2003). *Ibid.*, *Fifty-ninth Session, Supplement No. 40 (A/59/40)*, Report of the Human Rights Committee, vol. II, annex IX, sect. DD, p. 301.

Communication No. 1051/2002: *Ahani v. Canada* (Views adopted on 29 March 2004). *Ibid.*, sect. BB, p. 260.

E. NATIONAL COURTS

France

Conseil d'État, 4 October 2004, *Ministry of the Interior, internal security and local freedoms v. M. Bouziane* (confirmation of expulsion order).