

CRIMINALISATION OF SOLIDARITY IS A POLITICAL ACT

The EU needs to stand up for human rights at home too

By Marta Gionco, advocacy officer, Platform for International Cooperation on Undocumented Migrants

Acting in solidarity with migrants in the EU has been difficult for decades. Nearly twenty years ago, three volumes of PICUM's Book of Solidarity highlighted "the alarming tendency to criminalise assistance to undocumented migrants".¹ Between 2015 and 2019, research shows that at least 171 individuals were criminalised in 13 EU Member States.² Far from slowing down, the criminalisation of solidarity with migrants in the EU is soaring. Over the past couple of years, several states adopted increasingly restrictive legal frameworks for NGOs, while others are trying new criminalisation tactics.³ At the same time, proposed legislation at the EU level would hinder even more the

work of individuals and NGOs defending the rights of migrants.

Increasingly, what we see is that all acts around the migration journey can be criminalised: from steering a boat which is going adrift, to rescuing people at sea, to providing essential services, information, a roof, assistance during the asylum procedure, denouncing human rights violations at borders, to helping people in return procedures (see infographic). At the core of these trends, there is the criminalisation of migration itself – both in the language and narrative, and in the legal framework of several EU member states.

A SHRINKING LEGAL SPACE: A RACE TO THE BOTTOM

A legal framework facilitating and protecting the role and functioning of civil society organisations is a vital element of a democratic state.⁴ However, it is well documented that an increasing number of legal reforms throughout several member states have had the opposite effect of shrinking civic space and hindering the work of NGOs. In a few countries, these legislative changes have directly or indirectly targeted migrants' rights defenders. In **Hungary**, a reform of the Tax Laws in 2018 imposed a special tax of 25% on financial support provided for any activities that support or promote immigration. Among the activities covered are "participating in a media campaign", "building and

WHAT WE SEE IS THAT ALL ACTS AROUND THE MIGRATION JOURNEY CAN BE CRIMINALISED

¹ PICUM, 2002, Book of Solidarity, Vol. 1.

² ReSOMA, 2020, *The criminalisation of solidarity in Europe*.

³ Amnesty International, 3 March 2020, *Europe: Punishing compassion: Solidarity on trial in Fortress Europe*.

⁴ OSCE/ODIHR, 2015, *Guidelines on Freedom of Association*, p.5.



THE AUTHORS

Marta Gionco joined PICUM in 2019 and is expert in detention, return and criminalisation. She previously worked on migration and access to social protection for the International Labour Organisation (ILO) and on human rights defenders' protection for the World Organisation Against Torture (OMCT). She holds a Master in Laws and a MSc in Migration, Mobility and Development.

ORGANISATION

PICUM, the Platform for International Cooperation on Undocumented Migrants, is a network of organisations working to ensure social justice and human rights for undocumented migrants.

operating a network”, “educational activities”, and “positive propaganda”.⁵

In Greece, the Ministerial Decision 3063/2020 issued on 14 April 2020 and the Ministerial Decision 10616/2020 of 9 September 2020 introduced new measures wherein all Greek or foreign NGOs as well as their members, staff and volunteers would have to register with the NGO Members Registry to work in the fields of asylum, migration or integration.

⁵ Financial Times, 20 July 2018, Hungary toughens migrants stance with ‘propaganda’ tax [checked on 27 August 2021].

NGOs working in Greece have expressed concern that this policy will further shrink the country’s already limited civil society space. These concerns were confirmed by an Opinion of the expert council on NGO law of the Council of Europe, which found that “onerous registration and certification requirements, coupled with the wide discretions on the competent authorities to refuse to register or certify applicant NGOs”, will further restrict civil society space in Greece, and increase “significantly and disproportionately the control of the State over the work of NGOs in the field of asylum, migration and social inclusion.”⁶

In Cyprus, Amendment 118 (I)/2020 of the 2017 Law on Associations and Foundations and Other Related Issues gives the Minister of Interior the power to start a dissolution process for NGOs if certain regulatory requirements were not met within a two-month notice period.⁷ Shortly after, this power was used to remove KISA, a leading non-governmental organisation fighting for equality in Cyprus, and many other civil society organisations, from the Register

⁶ Expert Council on NGO Law, 2 July 2020, Opinion on the compatibility with European standards of recent and planned amendments to the Greek legislation on NGO registration; Expert Council on NGO Law, 23 November 2020, Addendum to the opinion on the compatibility with European standards of recent and planned amendments to the Greek legislation on NGO registration.

⁷ <http://www.moi.gov.cy/moi/moiup/moi.nsf/>

of Associations.⁸ The deregistration was carried out despite KISA indicating that all formal requirements would be met within a short time period and appealing against the Minister’s decision. KISA has, in the meantime, submitted to the Registrar of Associations all formal requirements of the Law, namely its audited accounts for 2019, the amended statutes and the names of the new Steering Committee, with their positions and contact details.⁹

In a letter to the Minister of Interior of Cyprus, the Council of Europe Commissioner for Human Rights Dunja Mijatović suggested that this action might be in violation of the principles of necessity and proportionality and international standards.¹⁰ Several UN special procedures further considered the deregistration of KISA “very troubling” and potentially in violation of Articles 19 and 22 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights.¹¹

Despite these actions and international calls for solidarity with KISA¹², in June 2021 KISA’s recourse against the decision of the General Registrar was rejected. With this decision, the court considered that the Ministry of Interior had the right to deregister an NGO which has been active in the fields of migration and human rights for 23 years, simply because it did not inform the Registrar of Associations on

⁸ PICUM, 19 February 2021, Organisations across Europe call on Cypriot government to reinstate equality champion KISA.

⁹ Kisa, 20 January 2021, <https://kisa.org.cy/wp-content/uploads/2021/01/SLet-Eforos-20012021-1.pdf>.

¹⁰ Dunja Mijatović, 10 March 2021, Letter to Mr. Nicos Nouris, Minister of Interior of Cyprus, Commissioner for Human Rights and Council of Europe, Strasbourg.

¹¹ Mandates of the Special Rapporteur on the rights to freedom of peaceful assembly and of association; the Special Rapporteur on the promotion and protection of the right to freedom of opinion and expression; the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights defenders; the Special Rapporteur on the human rights of migrants; and the Special Rapporteur on trafficking in persons, especially women and children, 31 March 2021, Communication to the Cyprus Government regarding the deteriorating environment for civil society organizations in Cyprus (AL CYP 1/2021), Palais des Nations, Geneva, Switzerland.

¹² PICUM, 19 February 2021, Organisations across Europe call on Cypriot government to reinstate equality champion KISA [checked on 27 August 2021].

THE TERM
“CRIMINALISATION OF
MIGRATION” REFERS
TO POLICIES THAT
TREAT UNDOCUMENTED
MIGRANTS AS A
POTENTIAL SECURITY
THREAT AND IRREGULAR
MIGRATION AS A CRIME

time that its constitution was compatible with the Associations and Institutions Law (104(I)/2017).¹³ As a consequence, KISA's bank accounts have been frozen since mid-February, leaving the organisation unable to pay costs related to salaries, rent, ongoing activities and other expenses, and to receive any funding from ongoing projects and other sources.

DOUBLE-DISCRIMINATION: THE CRIMINALISATION OF MIGRANT HUMAN RIGHTS DEFENDERS

As mentioned above, at the core of the criminalisation of solidarity with migrants is the criminalisation of migration itself. The term “*criminalisation of migration*” refers to policies that treat undocumented migrants as a potential security threat and irregular migration as a crime (e.g. by criminalising acts such as irregular entry and stay). As highlighted by the Special Rapporteur on the Human Rights of Migrants, this is intrinsically connected with the use of the word “*illegal*”, which denies migrants’ humanity.¹⁴ In 2014, at least 24 EU member states criminalised irregular entry and/or stay with imprisonment and/or a fine.¹⁵ Moreover, migrants who act in solidarity with other migrants are disproportionately hit by criminalisation policies. Indeed, criminal proceedings, including when they end in acquittals, can have a life-long impact on migrants’ human rights defenders’ possibility to live regularly in the EU. A first instance conviction, or even just reliable proof for suspicion, can have the effect of excluding them from the right to apply for asylum¹⁶ and from

¹³ KISA, 30 June 2021, KISA after the rejection of its appeal by the Administrative Court.

¹⁴ United Nations General Assembly, 3 August 2010, Report of the Special Rapporteur on the human rights

of migrants, Sixty-fifth session, A/65/222.

¹⁵ European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights (FRA), 27 March 2014, Criminalisation of migrants in an irregular situation and of persons engaging with them.

¹⁶ European Asylum Support Office (EASO), January 2016, Exclusion: Articles 12 and 17 Qualification

future applications for residence status. Even after an acquittal, migrants who have been accused of smuggling often have difficulties accessing asylum procedures, and they are often excluded from official reception centres.¹⁷

On 13 May 2021, a 27-year-old Somali asylum seeker was sentenced to 146 years in prison on the island of Lesbos for migrant smuggling from Turkey to Greece. Other migrants defended him in the Greek court, saying he started steering their boat to save lives after a

**MIGRANTS WHO ACT
IN SOLIDARITY WITH
OTHER MIGRANTS ARE
DISPROPORTIONALLY HIT
BY CRIMINALISATION
POLICIES**

capsizing.¹⁸ In April 2021, a Syrian man was sentenced in Greek court to 53 years in prison, accused of “*facilitating illegal entry*” and causing a shipwreck after Greek authorities accused him of having been at the helm of a boat that brought his family and as many as 40 people to safety.¹⁹ In May 2020, the Croatian Ministry of Interior revoked the refugee status of an Iraqi citizen volunteering for a Croatian organisation supporting migrants on allegations that he represents a “*threat to national security*”.²⁰ The move comes after

Directive (2011/95/EU), A Judicial Analysis, p. 42.

¹⁷ Patane, F., Bolhuis, M., van Wijk, J., & Kreienschiek, H., 2020, *Asylum-Seekers Prosecuted for Human Smuggling: A Case Study of Scafisti in Italy*. Refugee Survey Quarterly, 39(2), 123-152.

¹⁸ Info Migrants, 14 May 2021, Greece: Migrant accused of smuggling sentenced to 146 years in prison [checked on 27 August 2021].

¹⁹ ECRE, 30 April 2021, Greece: Scandalous Sentence for Young Refugee, Request to Commission, Legal Action Before ECtHR and Ombudsman Report on Pushbacks [checked on 27 August 2021].

²⁰ Frontline Defenders, 21 July 2021, Pressure on family member of migrant rights defender Tajana Tadić [checked on 27 August 2021].

several episodes where he and his partner, who also works for the same organisation, were intimidated by the police and questioned about their work.

In Malta, three teenagers, known as *El Hiblu 3*, who resisted pushbacks to Libya in 2019 are now accused of terrorism. The three teenagers, who at that time were 15, 16 and 19 years old, acted as translators during a collective protest against an attempted pushback of 108 people from Malta to Libya, where they would be facing torture and ill-treatment. Upon arrival in Malta, they were immediately detained for seven months and are now on parole. The case against them is still ongoing, with the first witness summoned only in March 2021.²¹

THE EU PACT ON MIGRATION AND ASYLUM: MORE POLICING AND FEWER CIVIC RIGHTS

The EU Pact on Migration and Asylum is a policy document setting out the EU's agenda on migration and a package of legislative proposals and recommendations for the years to come.²² The European Commission presented the Pact in September 2020, allegedly with the purpose of “*offering a fresh start*” and “*providing a comprehensive approach, bringing together policy in the areas of migration, asylum, integration and border management*”.²³

The Pact has been broadly criticised for its impact on fundamental rights, increasing

²¹ BBC, 9 August 2021, Malta: The teenagers pulled from the sea and accused of terrorism [checked on 27 August 2021].

²² European Commission, 23 September 2020, Migration and Asylum Package: New Pact on Migration and Asylum documents adopted on 23 September 2020.

²³ European Commission, 23 September 2020, Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions on a New Pact on Migration and Asylum; European Commission, 23 September 2020, Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions on a New Pact on Migration and Asylum.

detention, including for children outside of the legal framework, and curtailing safeguards.²⁴ In addition, a number of provisions would risk further stiffening the criminalisation of solidarity with migrants.

First of all, the Commission Guidance on the implementation of EU rules on the definition and prevention of the facilitation of unauthorised entry, transit and residence²⁵ only invites member states not to criminalise acts that are “*mandated by law*”, which are very different from acts “*permitted by law*”. Activities like providing food, shelter, car lifts or information, all remain excluded, particularly when they are not carried out by an official NGO that is “*mandated*” to carry out such activities. The almost exclusive focus on search and rescue (SAR) also risks leaving out activities on the territory and activities that are not directly lifesaving. Search and rescue operations are only considered legitimate when they “*observe the instructions received from the coordinating authority*” and while “*complying with the relevant legal framework*”, which leaves the door open to the prosecution of NGOs under (often trumped-up) accusations of breaching national legislation or instructions on disembarkation.²⁶

Secondly, the Commission Recommendation on cooperation among Member States concerning operations carried out by vessels owned or operated by private entities for the purpose of search and rescue activities further imposes a number of (not so hidden) obligations on SAR NGOs. These include “*safety and health requirements*”, reporting obligations on the administrative structure

²⁴ European Parliament, August 2021, The European Commission’s New Pact on Migration and Asylum Horizontal substitute impact assessment.

²⁵ European Commission, 23 September 2020, Commission Guidance on the implementation of EU rules on definition and prevention of the facilitation of unauthorised entry, transit and residence.

²⁶ PICUM, October 2020, More detention, fewer safeguards: How the new EU Pact on Migration and Asylum creates new loopholes to ignore human rights obligations.

WHEN INDEPENDENT JUDGES ARE CALLED TO DECIDE, THERE IS HOPE FOR JUSTICE TO BE ACHIEVED

of the NGO, and verification of “*compliance with migration management rules*”.²⁷ The Recommendation reinforces the link between migrant smuggling and SAR NGOs, suggesting that “*it is essential to avoid a situation in which migrant smuggling or human trafficking networks, including criminal organisations trafficking people or engaging in forms of exploitation assimilated to slavery, take advantage of the rescue operations conducted by private vessels in the Mediterranean*”.

Thirdly, the Screening Regulation²⁸ does indicate that EU member states “*may*” authorise relevant NGOs to provide information and monitor fundamental rights at borders. Yet, there is no clear obligation to grant NGOs access to border facilities, which means states might also decide to exclude them.²⁹

Last but not least, the same Regulation foresees that, at the end of the pre-entry screening, authorities fill in a debriefing form (art. 13). While the information included in the briefing will remarkably impact individuals’ future options, this is provided in the absence of a lawyer and with no adequate information. Individuals have no right to see the briefing, do

²⁷ European Commission, 23 September 2020, Commission Recommendation on cooperation among Member States concerning operations carried out by vessels owned or operated by private entities for the purpose of search and rescue activities.

²⁸ European Commission, 23 September 2020, Proposal for a REGULATION OF THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT AND OF THE COUNCIL introducing a screening of third country nationals at the external borders and amending Regulations (EC) No 767/2008, (EU) 2017/2226, (EU) 2018/1240 and (EU) 2019/817 COM/2020/612 final.

²⁹ PICUM, April 2021, PICUM recommendations on the screening regulation.

not have to sign it, and cannot appeal it. Importantly, the briefing includes “*information on assistance provided by a person or a criminal organisation in relation to unauthorised crossing of the border, and any related information in cases of suspected smuggling*”. **This information could be used to initiate criminal proceedings against human rights defenders, NGOs and migrants themselves.**

However, if information on migrant smuggling is collected in the context of the application for asylum or the provision of information on individuals’ asylum application, individuals might feel psychologically constrained to provide information on any assistance received, including by family and friends, in order to support their asylum application. Moreover, this information would be collected while individuals are in situations of deprivation of liberty.

The use of this evidence would risk violating the right not to be compelled to incriminate oneself.³⁰ Considering the high number of European Court of Human Rights cases which found that the conditions in border detention centers amount to a violation of article 3 of the European Convention of Human Rights,³¹ the evidence collected during this process should be deemed inadmissible as it is extracted as a result of psychological coercion, in situations of fundamental rights violations, and without the defence counsel present.

THE JUDICIAL POWER: ROOM FOR HOPE?

After almost two years, on 19 May 2021, the Public Prosecutor of Agrigento, Sicily, dismissed the case against Carola

³⁰ Council of Europe: European Commission on Human Rights, 27 August 1991, Murray v. The United Kingdom, 18731/91; ECHR, 5 February 2003, Allan v. United Kingdom, App. no. 48539/99.

³¹ ECtHR, 29 April 2013, Case of R.R. and Others v. Hungary, Application no. 19400/11; ECtHR, 11 September 2009, S.D. v. Greece, App. no. 53541/07; ECtHR, 22 July 2010, A. A. v. Greece, App. no. 12186/08.

Rackete.³² The facts date back to the night of 29 June 2019, when Carola Rackete, the Sea Watch 3 ship commander, entered the Port of Lampedusa, invoking the state of necessity as she could no longer guarantee safety on board to the 42 people rescued 17 days before. A police patrol boat tried to stop her twice, and she was arrested on charges of “*resistance or violence against a warship*”, a crime that includes a sentence of between three and ten years.³³ The prosecutor of Agrigento maintained that she acted out of a state of necessity and had the duty to bring the migrants to a safe harbour.

Equally, after four years, on 31 March 2021, the French Court of Cassation dismissed the case against Cédric Herrou, a farmer who was charged in 2017 with facilitation of irregular entry for guiding nearly 200 migrants through the mountains between France and Italy.³⁴ In 2018, the French Constitutional Council upheld the “*principle of fraternity*” and overturned his first conviction, sending the case back to the Court of Appeal in Lyon. In May 2020, the Lyon Court of Appeal discharged him, but the prosecutor appealed the decision. By rejecting the prosecutor’s appeal and acquitting Cédric Herrou, the Court of Cassation finally put a halt to years of judicial harassment.

These two examples seem to indicate that, when independent judges are called to decide, there is hope for justice to be achieved. Indeed, in most cases, judges have found no sound evidence for convictions.³⁵

While this gives hope for the independence of the judiciary system, it also highlights how trials against migrants’ rights

defenders are, from the very beginning, merely political acts. And even when they end in acquittals – which, sadly, is very far from being always the case – the impact of lengthy processes, often lasting years and characterised by repeated appeals by the prosecutor against first-instance acquittals, is extremely harmful. Ample research has shown that even after the acquittal, irreparable harm is done to the reputation of NGOs and their volunteers, who have to bear the social, economic and psychological costs of the trial.³⁶ Indeed, the trials’ length and the slug-

**TRIALS AGAINST
MIGRANTS’ RIGHTS
DEFENDERS ARE, FROM
THE VERY BEGINNING,
MERELY POLITICAL ACTS**

gishness on the prosecutors’ sides often seem to suggest that, in many cases, the end goal seems not to be actual conviction, but a wider chilling effect on life-saving activities.

RECOMMENDATIONS

As analysed in the previous paragraphs, the criminalisation of migration and people acting in solidarity with migrants is a complex, deep-rooted phenomenon. At the source is the criminalisation of migration itself, and for this reason, the first step to work towards its end would be embracing a different narrative and approach of migration through legal changes which do not criminalise undocumented people and people crossing borders irregularly. This also includes refraining from xenophobic discourse, which foments a climate of suspicion

against migrants and NGOs and volunteers helping them.

Secondly, national legal frameworks should be amended in line with the OSCE’s Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights (ODIHR) Guidelines on Freedom of Association³⁷ and the Opinions of the expert council on NGO law of the Council of Europe.³⁸ The European Commission should monitor this in the Rule of Law report and initiate infringement proceedings when relevant. Thirdly, as several migrants’ and human rights’ defenders are unfairly accused of migrant smuggling, it is pivotal to narrow the interpretation of the crime of migrant smuggling in line with the UN Migrant Smuggling protocol and fundamental rights, by limiting it to acts carried out to obtain unjust profit and in connection with transnational organised crime. The interpretation of the crime of migrant smuggling should not prevent the realization of the fundamental rights of undocumented migrants, including access to housing, services and collective organising.

The European Parliament and the Council should propose and adopt amendments to the Screening Regulations aimed at clarifying that national, international and non-governmental organisations and bodies shall be allowed to participate in the fundamental rights monitoring and the provision of information (recital 23, article 7 and 8) and should delete the inclusion of “*information on assistance provided by a person or a criminal organisation in relation to unauthorised crossing of the border, and any related information*”

³⁷ OSCE/ODIHR and Venice Commission, 2015, Guidelines on Freedom of Association.

³⁸ See, for instance, ODIHR, Council of Europe – Expert Council on NGO law (2 July 2020) “Opinion on the compatibility with European standards of recent and planned amendments to the Greek legislation on NGO registration”, and Council of Europe – Expert Council on NGO law (23 November 2020) “Addendum to the opinion on the compatibility with European standards of recent and planned amendments to the Greek legislation on NGO registration”.

³² La Repubblica, 19 May 2021, I pm: “Niente processo per Carola Rackete, aveva il dovere di portare i migranti in porto”. E il gip archivia [checked on 27 August 2021].

³³ Ibid.

³⁴ Le Monde, 21 March 2021, Symbole de l’aide aux migrants en France, Cédric Herrou relaxé définitivement [checked on 30 August 2021].

³⁵ ReSoma, June 2019, *Crackdown on NGOs and volunteers helping refugees and other migrants*.

³⁶ ReSoma, December 2019, How could strategic litigation prevent policing of humanitarianism.

EUROPEAN UNION,
WHICH PRESENTS ITSELF
AS A LEADING ACTOR
IN THE PROTECTION
OF HUMAN RIGHTS
DEFENDERS IN ITS
RELATION WITH THIRD
COUNTRIES, SHOULD
PROMOTE THE SAME
PRINCIPLES IN ITS
INTERNAL ACTION

in cases of suspected smuggling” in the debriefing form.³⁹

And last but not least, the European Union, which presents itself as a leading actor in the protection of human rights defenders in its relation with third countries,⁴⁰ should promote the same principles in its internal action, including by developing clear guidelines, monitoring early signs of policing of solidarity as well as all cases of criminal investigations, promote a clear internal legal framework to prevent the risk of abuses, and dedicate EU funding to strategic litigation and support of human rights defenders in Europe. ■

³⁹ PICUM, April 2021, PICUM recommendations on the screening regulation.

⁴⁰ European Union External Action (EEAS), 2008, Ensuring protection - European Union guidelines on human rights defenders.

AT THE CORE OF THE CRIMINALISATION OF SOLIDARITY WITH MIGRANTS IS THE CRIMINALISATION OF MIGRATION ITSELF

1 MIGRATING IRREGULARLY



In 2014, 24 of the 27 EU Member States sanctioned irregular entry and/or stay with imprisonment and/or a fine.¹

¹ European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights (FRA), 26 March 2014, *Criminalisation of migrants in an irregular situation and of persons engaging with them*.

2 RESCUING PEOPLE AT SEA



In March 2021, 21 individuals and 3 organisations were accused of aiding and abetting irregular migration and risk up to 20 years of prison for search and rescue operations conducted between 2016 and 2017.² Among them are crew members of the Iuventaship, Vos Hestia and Vos Prudence rescue ships, operated by NGOs Jugend Rettet, Save The Children International (STC), and Médecins Sans Frontières (MSF).³

² Iuventa, 4 March 2021, *Italian prosecutor presses charges against the Iuventa crew* [checked on 27 August 2021].

³ Italy: *A slippery slope for human rights: The Iuventa case* [checked on 27 August 2021].

5 HOSTING AN ASYLUM SEEKER



On 13 June, Ingeborg Beugel, a correspondent for the Dutch magazine De Groene Amsterdammer, was arrested on the island of Hydra, Greece, for hosting a 23-year-old Afghan during the appeal against a negative asylum decision.⁵ The journalist now risks up to one year imprisonment and at least 5,000 euro in fines on charges of facilitating the stay of a person in an irregular situation on the Greek territory.

⁵ The Guardian, 24 June 2021, *Greek police arrest Dutch journalist for helping Afghan asylum seeker* [checked on 27 August 2021].

4 PROVIDING FOOD



In Spain, an NGO risked fines up to 60'000 EUR for having distributed food to undocumented migrants during the COVID-19 pandemic.⁴

⁴ El Salto, 1 April 2020, *Aplican la Ley Mordaza a una red de apoyo mutuo que reparte comida a migrantes en Barcelona* [checked on 27 August 2021].

3 PROVIDING ESSENTIAL SERVICES



On 23 February 2021, the Italian police raided the house of Lorena Fornasir, a 68-year-old psychotherapist and Gian Andrea Franchi, an 84-year-old retired teacher, founders of the organization “La Linea d’Ombra”, and confiscated their mobile phones and laptops as well as the archives of their organization and other material. Since 2015, they have been providing medicine, clothes, water and food to migrants in front of Trieste’s main train station, washing and curing the feet of those who have walked barefoot for miles. They are now accused of aiding and abetting irregular immigration.

6 MONITORING FUNDAMENTAL RIGHTS VIOLATIONS



On 24 April 2020, 4 members of the organisation Utopia 56 were arrested for one day for having filmed the evacuation of a migrants’ camp in Grande-Synthe in northern France.⁶

⁶ Utopia56, 28 April 2020, *L’état d’urgence sanitaire autorise-t-il les violences envers les exilé.e.s et les intima-*

7 SUPPORTING PEOPLE IN RETURN PROCEDURES



In the UK, the “Stanstead 15” group of human rights defenders were charged with aggravated trespass and “endangering safety at aerodromes” – a charge which carries a maximum penalty of a life sentence – for stopping a charter deportation flight in March 2017. Some of the people on the flight were facing threats of death and serious danger over deportation, and 11 of them were granted a regular status in the UK afterwards.⁷

tions envers les bénévoles? [checked on 27 August 2021].
⁷ Amnesty International, 3 March 2020, *Europe: Punishing compassion: Solidarity on trial in Fortress Europe*, p.84.