

Country Report: Hungary



Hungarian Helsinki Committee

Acknowledgements & Methodology

This report was written by Márta Pardavi, Gruša Matevžič, Júlia Iván and Anikó Bakonyi of the Hungarian Helsinki Committee (HHC), the first three updates were written by Gruša Matevžič, the fourth update was written by Gruša Matevžič, Júlia Iván, Anikó Bakonyi and Gábor Gyulai, and the 2016 and 2017 updates were written by András Alföldi, Gruša Matevžič, Zita Barcza-Szabó and Zsolt Szekeres. The report was edited by ECRE.

The information for the report were obtained from the interviews with the HHC staff and contracted attorneys, UNHCR Hungary, Menedék Hungarian Association for Migrants, SOS Children's Villages, from available reports and from questionnaires submitted to the Hungarian authorities.

The information in this report is up-to-date as of 31 December 2017, unless otherwise stated.

The Asylum Information Database (AIDA)

The Asylum Information Database (AIDA) is coordinated by the European Council on Refugees and Exiles (ECRE). It aims to provide up-to date information on asylum practice in 23 countries. This includes 20 EU Member States (AT, BE, BG, CY, DE, ES, FR, GR, HR, HU, IE, IT, MT, NL, PL, PT, RO, SE, SI, UK) and 3 non-EU countries (Serbia, Switzerland, Turkey) which is accessible to researchers, advocates, legal practitioners and the general public through the dedicated website www.asylumineurope.org. The database also seeks to promote the implementation and transposition of EU asylum legislation reflecting the highest possible standards of protection in line with international refugee and human rights law and based on best practice.



This report is part of the Asylum Information Database (AIDA), funded by the European Programme for Integration and Migration (EPIM), a collaborative initiative by the Network of European Foundations, and the European Union's Asylum, Migration and Integration Fund (AMIF). The contents of this report are the sole responsibility of ECRE and can in no way be taken to reflect the views of EPIM or the European Commission.



Table of Contents

Glossary & List of Abbreviations	6
Statistics	7
Overview of the legal framework	9
Overview of the main changes since the previous report update.....	11
Asylum Procedure	13
A. General	13
1. Flow chart.....	13
2. Types of procedures	14
3. List of authorities intervening in each stage of the procedure	14
4. Number of staff and nature of the first instance authority	14
5. Short overview of the asylum procedure.....	15
B. Access to the procedure and registration	17
1. Access to the territory and push backs	17
2. Registration of the asylum application	20
C. Procedures	22
1. Regular procedure	22
2. Dublin	30
3. Admissibility procedure	37
4. Border procedure (border and transit zones).....	41
5. Accelerated procedure	45
D. Guarantees for vulnerable groups	47
1. Identification	47
2. Special procedural guarantees	50
3. Use of medical reports	52
4. Legal representation of unaccompanied children	53
E. Subsequent applications.....	55
F. The safe country concepts.....	57
1. First country of asylum	57
2. Safe third country	57
3. Safe country of origin	60

G. Relocation	61
H. Information for asylum seekers and access to NGOs and UNHCR	61
I. Differential treatment of specific nationalities in the procedure	63
Reception Conditions.....	64
A. Access and forms of reception conditions	64
1. Criteria and restrictions to access reception conditions.....	64
2. Forms and levels of material reception conditions.....	65
3. Reduction or withdrawal of reception conditions.....	65
4. Freedom of movement.....	66
B. Housing	67
1. Types of accommodation	67
2. Conditions in reception facilities.....	69
C. Employment and education	70
1. Access to the labour market.....	70
2. Access to education	70
D. Health care	72
E. Special reception needs of vulnerable groups	73
F. Information for asylum seekers and access to reception centres	74
1. Provision of information.....	74
2. Access to reception centres by third parties	74
G. Differential treatment of specific nationalities in reception	75
Detention of Asylum Seekers	76
A. General.....	76
B. Legal framework of detention	77
1. Grounds for detention	77
2. Alternatives to detention.....	79
3. Detention of vulnerable applicants	81
4. Duration of detention.....	84
C. Detention conditions	84
1. Place of detention	84
2. Conditions in detention facilities.....	85
3. Access to detention facilities	90
D. Procedural safeguards	91

1. Judicial review of the detention order	91
2. Legal assistance for review of detention	95
E. Differential treatment of specific nationalities in detention	96
Content of International Protection	97
A. Status and residence	97
1. Residence permit	97
2. Civil registration	98
3. Long-term residence	99
4. Naturalisation	99
5. Cessation and review of protection status	101
6. Withdrawal of protection status	103
B. Family reunification	104
1. Criteria and conditions	104
2. Status and rights of family members	105
C. Movement and mobility	105
1. Freedom of movement	105
2. Travel documents	105
D. Housing	106
E. Employment and education	107
1. Access to the labour market	107
2. Access to education	108
F. Social welfare	109
G. Health care	109
ANNEX I - Transposition of the CEAS in national legislation	110

Glossary & List of Abbreviations

8-km Rule	Rule entering into force on 5 July 2016, allowing Hungarian police to automatically push back asylum seekers who are apprehended within 8 km of the Serbian-Hungarian or Croatian-Hungarian border to the external side of the border fence, without registering their data or allowing them to submit an asylum claim.
Kúria	Hungarian Supreme Court
Rule 39 request	Request under Rule 39 of the Rules of the European Court of Human Rights for interim measures before a case is decided.
CJEU	Court of Justice of the European Union
CoE	Council of Europe
COI	Country of origin information
CPT	European Committee for the Prevention of Torture
EASO	European Asylum Support Office
ECHR	European Convention on Human Rights
ECtHR	European Court of Human Rights
EMN	European Migration Network
HHC	Hungarian Helsinki Committee
IAO	Immigration and Asylum Office
MSF	Médecins sans Frontières
OPCAT	Optional Protocol to the Convention Against Torture
PTSD	Post-traumatic stress disorder
TEGYESZ	Department of Child Protection Services Területi Gyermekvédelmi Szakszolgálat
UNHCR	United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees
UNHRC	United Nations Human Rights Committee

Statistics

Overview of statistical practice

Statistical information on asylum applicants and main countries of origin, as well as overall numbers and outcome of first instance decisions, is made available on a monthly basis by the Immigration and Asylum Office (IAO).¹ The Hungarian Helsinki Committee (HHC) also publishes brief statistical overviews on a monthly basis.²

Applications and granting of protection status at first instance: 2017

	Applicants in 2017	Pending at end 2017	Refugee status	Subsidiary protection	Humanitarian protection	Rejection	Refugee rate	Subs. Prot. rate	Hum. Prot. rate	Rejection rate
Total	3,397	678	106	1,110	75	2,880	2.5%	26.6%	1.8%	69.1%

Breakdown by countries of origin of the total numbers

Afghanistan	1,432	241	20	509	52	1,220	1.1%	28.3%	2.9%	67.7%
Iraq	812	121	10	168	10	510	1.4%	24.1%	1.4%	73.1%
Syria	577	108	10	374	2	573	1%	39%	0.2%	59.8%
Pakistan	163	32	10	1	0	154	6.1%	0.6%	0%	93.3%
Iran	109	46	30	5	2	87	24.2%	4%	1.6%	70.2%
Algeria	62	4	0	0	0	91	0%	0%	0%	100%
Turkey	29	4	0	1	1	19	0%	4.7%	4.7%	90.6%
Morocco	24	2	0	0	0	41	0%	0%	0%	100%
Cuba	21	2	0	8	1	28	0%	21.6%	2.7%	75.7%
Unknown	18	9	9	13	0	2	37.5%	54.2%	0%	8.3%
Somalia	9	1	1	11	0	3	6.7%	73.3%	0%	20%
Georgia	6	5	0	1	5	0	0%	16.7%	83.3%	0%

Source: IAO. Rejections cover inadmissibility decisions.

2,800 asylum applications of the 3,397 were submitted in the transit zones.

¹ Statistical reports of the IAO may be found at: <https://goo.gl/xgV1tN>.

² Statistical overviews by the HHC may be found at: <http://www.helsinki.hu/en/press-room/press-releases/>.

Gender/age breakdown of the total number of applicants: 2017

	Number	Percentage
Total number of applicants	3,397	-
Men	2,156	63.5%
Women	1,241	36.5%
Children	1,596	47%
Unaccompanied children	232	6.8%

Source: IAO

Comparison between first instance and appeal decision rates: 2017

	First instance		Appeal	
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
Total number of decisions	4,171	-	685	-
Positive decisions	1,291	30.9%	409	59.7%
• <i>Refugee status</i>	106	2.5%	-	-
• <i>Subsidiary protection</i>	1,110	26.6%	-	-
• <i>Humanitarian protection</i>	75	1.8%	-	-
Negative decisions	2,880	69.1%	276	40.3%

Source: IAO. Rejections cover inadmissibility decisions. Positive decisions at court level concern annulments of first instance decisions.

Overview of the legal framework

Main legislative acts relevant to asylum procedures, reception conditions, detention and content of protection

Title (EN)	Original Title (HU)	Abbreviation	Web Link
Act LXXX of 2007 on Asylum <i>Amended by:</i> Act XX of 2017 on the amendment of certain acts to tighten the procedures conducted on the border <i>Amended by:</i> Act CXLIII of 2017 amending certain acts relating to migration	2007. évi LXXX Törvény a menedékjogról 2017. évi XX. törvény a határőrizeti területen lefolytatott eljárás szigorításával kapcsolatos egyes törvények módosításáról 2017. évi CXLIII. törvény az egyes migrációs tárgyú törvények módosításáról	Asylum Act March 2017 amendments January 2018 amendments	https://goo.gl/F4mpfi (EN) http://bit.ly/1IFdMk2 (HU) http://bit.ly/2FhfYQp (HU) http://bit.ly/2GucLwy (HU)
Act II of 2007 on the Entry and Stay of Third-Country Nationals	2007. évi II. törvény a harmadik országbeli állampolgárok beutazásáról és tartózkodásáról	TCN Act	http://bit.ly/1S4bdd1 (HU)
Act CL of 2016 on General Administrative Code	2016. évi törvény az általános közgazgatási rendtartásról	GAC	http://bit.ly/2HxPwTI (HU)
Act LXXX of 2003 on Legal Aid	2003. évi LXXX. törvény a jogi segítségnyújtásról	Legal Aid Act	http://bit.ly/1QqHj5c (EN) http://bit.ly/1f4v65u (HU)

Main implementing decrees and administrative guidelines and regulations relevant to asylum procedures, reception conditions, detention and content of protection

Title (EN)	Original Title (HU)	Abbreviation	Web Link
Government Decree no. 301/2007 (XI. 9.) on the implementation of Act LXXX of 2007 on asylum <i>Amended by:</i> Government Decree no. 70/2017. (V.30.) on the amendments of certain governmental decrees to tighten the procedures conducted on the border <i>Amended by:</i> Government Decree no. 147/2017. (VI. 12.) on the amendments of Government Decree no. 301/2007 (XI. 9.) on the implementation of Act LXXX of 2007 on asylum <i>Amended by:</i> Government Decree no. 411/2017.	301/2007. (XI. 9.) Korm. rendelet a menedékjogról szóló 2007. évi LXXX. törvény végrehajtásáról 70/2017. (III. 31.) Korm. rendelet a határőrizeti területen lefolytatott eljárás szigorításával kapcsolatos egyes kormányrendeletek módosításáról 147/2017. (VI. 12.) Korm. rendelet a menedékjogról szóló 2007. évi LXXX. törvény végrehajtásáról szóló 301/2007. (XI. 9.) Korm. rendelet módosításáról 411/2017. (XII. 15.) Korm. rendelet az egyes migrációs	Asylum Decree Decree 70/2017 Decree 147/2017 Decree	http://bit.ly/1QLMdEM (HU) http://bit.ly/2EIkWZP (HU) http://bit.ly/2EFu40X (HU) http://bit.ly/2Hvqm80 (HU)

(XII. 15.) on the amendments of certain governmental decrees relating to migration and others	tárgyú és velük összefüggésben egyes további kormányrendeletek módosításáról	411/2017	
Government Decree no. 114/2007 (V. 24.) on the Implementation of Act II of 2007 on the Entry and Stay of Third-Country Nationals <i>Amended by:</i> Government Decree no. 70/2017. (V.30.) on the amendments of certain governmental decrees to tighten the procedures conducted on the border	2007. évi II. törvény a harmadik országbeli állampolgárok beutazásáról és tartózkodásáról, egységes szerkezetben a végrehajtásról szóló 114/2007 (V. 24.) Korm. rendelettel 70/2017. (III. 31.) Korm. rendelet a határőrizeti területen lefolytatott eljárás szigorításával kapcsolatos egyes kormányrendeletek módosításáról	TCN Decree Decree 70/2017	http://bit.ly/1Gs2a1D (HU) http://bit.ly/2ElkWZP (HU)
Interior Minister Decree no. 29/2013 (VI.28.) on the rules of execution of asylum detention and bail	29/2013. (VI. 28.) BM rendelet a menekültügyi őrizet végrehajtásának szabályairól és a menekültügyi óvadékról	Decree 29/2013	http://bit.ly/111uvbJ (HU)
Government Decree no. 191/2015 (VII. 21.) on safe countries of origin and safe third countries	191/2015 (VII. 21.) A nemzeti szinten biztonságosnak nyilvánított származási országok és biztonságos harmadik országok meghatározásáról	Decree 191/2015	http://bit.ly/1PNamgZ (HU)

Overview of the main changes since the previous report update

The report was previously updated in **February 2017**.

A quasi-state of exception introduced into Hungarian law in September 2015, entitled as the “state of crisis due to mass migration”, was again prolonged until 6 September 2018. During this state of crisis special rules apply to third-country nationals irregularly entering and/or staying in Hungary and to those seeking asylum, and certain provisions of Asylum Act are suspended.

Asylum procedure

- ❖ **Push backs:** Police are authorised to push back to Serbia across the border fence irregularly staying migrants who wish to seek asylum in Hungary from any part of the country, without any legal procedure or opportunity to challenge this measure.
- ❖ **Registration:** Asylum applications can only be submitted in the transit zones at the border with Serbia unless the applicant is already residing lawfully in the territory of Hungary. Asylum seekers (except unaccompanied minors below 14 years of age) have to stay in the transit zone for the whole duration of their asylum procedure. From 23 January 2018 only one person is let in each transit zone per day.
- ❖ **Appeal:** The deadlines to seek judicial review against inadmissibility decisions and rejections of asylum applications decided in accelerated procedures are drastically shortened to 3 days. From 2018 court clerks can no longer issue judgments.
- ❖ **Border procedure:** The border and airport procedures are currently not applicable.
- ❖ **Special procedural guarantees:** Amendments that entered into force in January 2018 describe detailed procedural safeguards for interviewing children, introduce additional safeguards for selection of interpreters and the possibility to choose a case officer and interpreter of the gender of the asylum seeker's choice on grounds that his or her gender identity is different from the gender registered in the official database.
- ❖ **Safe third country:** Inadmissibility decisions based on Serbia being a safe third country are no longer issued.
- ❖ **Guardianship:** Unaccompanied children above the age of 14 are not assigned a child protection guardian to be their permanent legal guardian but a temporary guardian (“case guardian” or “ad-hoc guardian”).
- ❖ **Exclusion:** A reform entering in to force on 1 January 2018 extended the grounds of exclusion from refugee status. A foreigner sentenced by a court's final and enforceable resolution for having committed a crime which is punishable by at least five years' imprisonment may not be recognised as a refugee.

Reception conditions

- ❖ **Reception capacity:** 94% of asylum seekers are detained either in the transit zones or in asylum detention. Open reception centres are almost empty. The Körmen tent camp closed down in May 2017.
- ❖ **Right to reception:** Asylum seekers in the transit zones are entitled only to reduced material conditions. Subsequent applicants are not entitled to food and other material support such as hygienic packages and clothes.

- ❖ **Access to employment:** Asylum seekers no longer have access to the labour market. They are neither entitled to work in the premises of the reception centres nor at any other work place.
- ❖ **Access to education:** Education in the transit zones started being provided only in September 2017, but it can hardly be perceived as effective education.

Detention of asylum seekers

- ❖ **Automatic detention:** All asylum seekers, including unaccompanied asylum-seeking children over 14 years of age and other vulnerable persons, are automatically detained in the transit zones for the whole duration of the asylum procedure, without any legal basis for detention or judicial remedies.
- ❖ **Asylum detention centres:** Out of 3 asylum detention facilities, only Nyírbátor remains in operation and only very few people are kept there.
- ❖ **Access to detention facilities:** In October 2017, the authorities terminated cooperation agreements with the HHC and have denied access to police detention, prisons and immigration detention after two decades of cooperation and over 2,000 visits. The HHC can no longer monitor human rights in closed institutions. No other organisation conducts monitoring visits in the closed facilities, including the transit zones, that would result in public reports.


Content of international protection

- ❖ **Integration:** The Government recently announced that they are stopping all Asylum, Migration and Integration Funding (AMIF) funding for 2019, on which NGOs providing integration support relied.

Asylum Procedure

A. General

1. Flow chart



2. Types of procedures

Indicators: Types of Procedures

Which types of procedures exist in your country?

- | | | |
|---|---|--|
| ❖ Regular procedure: | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No |
| ▪ Prioritised examination: ³ | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No |
| ▪ Fast-track processing: ⁴ | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No |
| ❖ Dublin procedure: | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No |
| ❖ Admissibility procedure: | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No |
| ❖ Border procedure: | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No |
| ❖ Accelerated procedure: ⁵ | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No |

Are any of the procedures that are foreseen in the law, not being applied in practice? ☒ Yes ☐ No

Section 35(7) of the Asylum Act provides that in the case of an unaccompanied child, the asylum procedure shall be conducted as a matter of priority, but in practice this is not always the case. The HHC is aware of unaccompanied children who have been held in the transit zone for more than 80 days, without any decision being issued in their case.

3. List of authorities intervening in each stage of the procedure

Stage of the procedure	Competent authority (EN)	Competent authority (HU)
Application at the border	Police Immigration and Asylum Office (IAO)	Rendőrség Bevándorlási és Menekültügyi Hivatal (BMH)
Application on the territory	Immigration and Asylum Office (IAO)	Bevándorlási és Menekültügyi Hivatal (BMH)
Dublin (responsibility assessment)	Dublin Coordination Unit, Immigration and Asylum Office (IAO)	Bevándorlási és Menekültügyi Hivatal (BMH)
Refugee status determination	Immigration and Asylum Office (IAO)	Bevándorlási és Menekültügyi Hivatal (BMH)
Appeal (Judicial review)	Regional Administrative and Labour Court	Közigazgatási és Munkaügyi Bíróság
Subsequent application (admissibility)	Immigration and Asylum Office (IAO)	Bevándorlási és Menekültügyi Hivatal (BMH)

4. Number of staff and nature of the first instance authority

Name in English	Number of staff	Ministry responsible	Is there any political interference possible by the responsible Minister with the decision making in individual cases by the first instance authority?
Immigration and Asylum Office (IAO)	434	Ministry of Interior	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

Source: IAO

³ For applications likely to be well-founded or made by vulnerable applicants. See Article 31(7) APD.

⁴ Accelerating the processing of specific caseloads as part of the regular procedure.

⁵ Labelled as “accelerated procedure” in national law. See Article 31(8) APD.

5. Short overview of the asylum procedure

A quasi-state of exception operates under Hungarian legislation, entitled “state of crisis due to mass migration”. The state of crisis can be ordered by a government decree, on the joint initiative of the Immigration and Asylum Office (IAO) and the Police, for a maximum of 6 months to certain counties or the entirety of the country. Once in effect, among others, the Hungarian Defence Forces is tasked with the armed protection of the border and with the assistance of the police forces in handling issues related to migration. The state of crisis due to mass migration has been in effect in the two counties bordering Serbia (Bács-Kiskun and Csongrád) since 15 September 2015, in the four counties bordering Croatia, Slovenia and Austria (Baranya, Somogy, Vas, Zala) since 18 September 2015. On 9 March 2016, the state of crisis was extended to the entire territory of Hungary. This has been extended four times since then and is currently in effect until 6 September 2018.

During this state of crisis special rules apply to third-country nationals unlawfully entering and/or staying in Hungary and to those seeking asylum, including:

- ❖ Police are authorised to push back across the border fence irregularly staying migrants who wish to seek asylum in Hungary from any part of the country, without any legal procedure or opportunity to challenge this measure.
- ❖ Asylum applications can only be submitted in the transit zones at the border unless the applicant is already residing lawfully in the territory of Hungary. Asylum seekers are to be held in the transit zones for the entire asylum procedure without any legal basis for detention or judicial remedies.
- ❖ All vulnerable persons and unaccompanied asylum-seeking children over 14 years of age are also automatically detained in the transit zones.
- ❖ The deadlines to seek judicial review against inadmissibility decisions and rejections of asylum applications decided in accelerated procedures are drastically shortened to 3 days.

The IAO, a government agency under the Ministry of Interior, is in charge of the asylum procedure through its Directorate of Refugee Affairs (asylum authority). The IAO is also in charge of operating the transit zones, open reception centres and closed asylum detention facilities for asylum seekers.

The asylum procedure is a single procedure where all claims for international protection are considered. The procedure consists of two instances. The first instance is an administrative procedure carried out by the IAO. The second instance is a judicial review procedure carried out by regional Administrative and Labour Courts, which are not specialised in asylum. There is an inadmissibility process and an accelerated procedure in addition to the normal procedure.

Asylum may only be sought at the border (inside the transit zone). This is due to the current status of mass migration emergency.⁶ Only those lawfully staying can apply for asylum in the country. The asylum procedure starts with the submission of an application for asylum in person before the asylum authority.

The asylum procedure starts with assessment of whether a person falls under a Dublin procedure. If this is not the case, the IAO proceeds with an examination of whether the application is inadmissible or whether it should be decided in accelerated procedure. The decision on this shall be made within 15 days. If the application is not inadmissible and it will not be decided in accelerated procedure, the IAO has to make a decision on the merits within 60 days.

Inadmissibility: An application is declared inadmissible if somebody (a) is an EU citizen; (b) has protection status from another EU Member state; (c) has protection from a third country and this country is willing to readmit the applicant; (d) submits a subsequent application and there are no new circumstances or facts; and (e) has travelled through a safe third country.

⁶ Section 80/J(1) Asylum Act.

Accelerated procedure: The accelerated procedure can be used if somebody; (a) has shared irrelevant information with the authorities regarding his or her asylum case; (b) comes from a safe country of origin; (c) gives false information about his or her name and country of origin; (d) destroys his or her travel documents with the aim to deceive the authorities; (e) provides contradictory, false and improbable information to the authorities; (f) submits a subsequent applicant with new facts and circumstances; (g) submits an application only to delay or stop his or her removal; (h) enters Hungary irregularly or extends his or her stay illegally and did not ask for asylum within reasonable time although he or she would have had the chance to do so; (i) does not give fingerprints; and (j) presents a risk to Hungary's security and order or has already had an expulsion order for this reason.

Border procedures exist in law but are not applicable at the moment due to the aforementioned state of mass migration emergency.

Regular procedure: The asylum application starts out with an interview by an asylum officer and an interpreter, usually immediately upon the entry in the transit zone. At that point, biometric data is taken, questions are asked about personal data, the route to Hungary and the main reasons for asking for international protection. Sometimes the IAO will conduct more than one interview with the applicant.

The asylum authority should consider whether the applicant should be recognised as a refugee, granted subsidiary protection or a tolerated stay under *non-refoulement* considerations. A personal interview is compulsory, unless the applicant is not fit for being heard, or submitted a subsequent application and, in the application, failed to state facts or provided proofs that would allow the recognition as a refugee or beneficiary of subsidiary protection.

Appeal: The applicant may challenge the negative IAO decision by requesting judicial review from the regional Administrative and Labour Court within 8 calendar days and within 3 calendar days in case of inadmissibility and in the accelerated procedure. The judicial review request will have suspensive effect on the IAO decision in the regular procedure. However in case of inadmissibility it will only have a suspensive effect if the application is declared inadmissible on "safe third country" grounds. In the accelerated procedure the judicial review has suspensive effect only if the accelerated procedure is applied because the applicant entered Hungary irregularly or extended his or her stay illegally and did not ask for asylum within reasonable time although he or she would have had the chance to do so.

The court should take a decision in 60 days in the normal procedure and in 8 days in case of inadmissibility and in the accelerated procedure. A personal hearing of the applicant is not compulsory. The court may uphold the IAO decision or may annul the IAO decision and order a new procedure.

Since March 2017, most asylum applications are examined in the transit zones and asylum seekers are required to remain in these transit zones, with the exception of unaccompanied children below the age of 14 who are placed in a childcare facility, and with the exception of those lawfully staying in the territory. In September 2017 the HHC published an information note on the asylum situation in Hungary following two years of successive reforms.⁷

⁷ HHC, *Two years after: What's Left of Refugee Protection in Hungary?*, September 2017, available at: <http://bit.ly/2EdCWqm>.

B. Access to the procedure and registration

1. Access to the territory and push backs

Indicators: Access to the Territory

1. Are there any reports (NGO reports, media, testimonies, etc.) of people refused entry at the border and returned without examination of their protection needs? ☒ Yes ☐ No

1.1. Regular entry through transit zones

The barbed-wire fence along the 175km long border section with Serbia was completed on 15 September 2015. A similar barbed-wire fence was erected a month later, on 16 October 2015, at the border with Croatia. So-called “transit zones” have been established as parts of the fence. The two transit zones along the Serbian border are located in **Tompa** and **Röszke**, while **Beremend** and **Letenye** are the transit zones along the Croatian border (these two were never operational). They consist of a series of containers which host actors in a refugee status determination procedure. The chain of authorities inhabiting the linked containers starts with the police who record the flight route, then, if an asylum application is submitted, a refugee officer to accept it, and finally, a judge in a “court hearing room”, who may only be present via an internet link;⁸ in the past, a court clerk could also have issued the judgment, but as of 2018 they are no longer entitled to do so.⁹ After the construction of the fences, the number of asylum seekers arriving in Hungary dropped significantly. Despite all of the measures taken with the explicit aim of diverting refugee and migrant flows from the Serbian border, this border section continues to be the fourth biggest entry point to Europe.¹⁰

According to government statements, on 15-16 September 2015 only 185 asylum seekers were allowed to enter the transit zones, while in **Röszke** many hundreds of others – mainly Syrian war refugees – were waiting outside, without any services (food, shelter etc.) provided by either the Serbian or the Hungarian state. The HHC witnessed that only very few asylum seekers were allowed to enter the transit zone, sometimes literally not a single person was let in for hours. In 2016 only 20-30 persons per day were let in at each transit zone.¹¹ From November 2016, only 10 persons were let in per day and only through working days, due to the changes in working hours of the IAO. In 2017, only 5 persons were let in per day in each transit zone. From 23 January 2018 only one person is let in each transit zone per day.¹² The above-described policy hinders access to the asylum procedure for most asylum seekers arriving at this border section of the EU.

The IAO decides exactly who can enter the transit zone on a particular day. Beginning in March 2016, an ever-growing number of migrants continued to gather in the “pre-transit zones”, which are areas partly on Hungarian territory that are sealed off from the actual transit zones by fences in the direction of Serbia. Here, migrants waited in the hope of entering the territory and the asylum procedure of Hungary in a lawful manner. Approximately one third of those waiting to access the transit zones were children. Although parts of the pre-transit zones are physically located on Hungarian soil, they are considered to be in “no man’s land” by Hungarian authorities, who provided little to nothing to meet basic human needs or human rights. Migrants waited idly in dire conditions.¹³

In autumn 2016, the Serbian authorities decided to terminate the practice of waiting in the pre-transit zone and now all asylum seekers that wish to be put on the waiting list in order to be let to the transit zone in Hungary need to be registered in one of the temporary reception centres in Serbia and wait

⁸ B Nagy, ‘Parallel realities: Refugees seeking asylum in Europe and Hungary’s reaction’, 4 November 2015, available at: <http://bit.ly/1LjTg3S>.

⁹ Section 94 of Act CXLI of 2017 amending certain acts relating to migration.

¹⁰ See Frontex, *Migratory routes map*, available at: <http://bit.ly/1FZMUyU>.

¹¹ HHC, *No country for refugees*, Information Note, 18 September 2015, available at: <http://bit.ly/1iQP8SC>.

¹² Info Park, ‘Hungary reduces quota for regular entry into asylum procedures’, 25 January 2018, available at: <http://bit.ly/2Fiaq8i>.

¹³ HHC, *Destitute, but waiting: Report on the visit to the Tompa and Röszke Pre-Transit Zone area on the Serbian-Hungarian border*, 22 April 2016, available at: <https://goo.gl/vc6BPr>.

there until it is their turn to enter the transit zone.¹⁴ The only person staying in the pre-transit zone for longer periods of time is the community leader, as discussed below. People who are about to enter the transit zone are brought to the pre-transit zone usually one day in advance of their entry.

The clear criteria that determine who is allowed access to the transit zone are time of arrival and extent of vulnerability. The other determining factors are not so clear. In **Röszke** there are three separate lists for those waiting: one for families, one for unaccompanied children and one for single men. In **Tompa** there is a single list containing the names of all three groups. The names are put on the list by the Serbian Commissariat for Refugees, once the people register at the temporary reception centres in Serbia. The list is then communicated to the so-called community leader (an asylum seeker) who is chosen by the Commissariat and who is placed in the pre-transit zone. The community leader then communicates the list to the Hungarian authorities. The Hungarian authorities allow people into the transit zones based on these lists and communicate the names of the people entering the transit zone in the following days to the community leader, who then informs the Commissariat who then informs the people. There is no official communication between the Hungarian and Serbian authorities on this matter.

Several abuses were reported regarding the use of the list.¹⁵ Families with small children enjoy priority over single men and usually some unaccompanied children are also allowed entry each Thursday. However, there are other determining factors when it comes to entry, which are not so clear and this lack of clarity further frustrates those waiting. The HHC believes that these lists should be considered as expressions of intention to seek asylum in Hungary and according to the recast Asylum Procedures Directive, Member States shall ensure that a person who has made an application for international protection has an effective opportunity to lodge it as soon as possible.¹⁶ Having to wait for months in order to be let in the transit zone is therefore clearly against the recast Asylum Procedures Directive. Information on waiting lists was confirmed in the report of the fact-finding mission by Ambassador Tomáš Boček, Special Representative of the Secretary General on migration and refugees to Serbia and two transit zones in Hungary.¹⁷

1.2. Irregular entry

Irregular entry into Hungary through the border fence is punishable by actual or suspended terms of imprisonment of up to ten years – and/or the imposition of an expulsion order. The criminal procedure is not suspended when the defendant has made an asylum application during the court hearing, which could have permitted consideration by the court of a defence under Article 31 of the 1951 Refugee Convention. Motions requesting suspension of the criminal proceedings that were submitted by the defendants' legal representatives were systematically rejected by the court on the grounds that eligibility for international protection was not a relevant issue to criminal liability. Individuals who made an asylum application in court were only referred to the IAO after being convicted and sentenced to expulsion. While their asylum applications have suspensive effect, and a "penitentiary judge" can impose a prohibition on enforcement of a court sentence of expulsion where the individual concerned is entitled to international protection,¹⁸ that prohibition does not annul the penal sentence, let alone the conviction. UNHCR thus considers that Hungary's law and practice in relation to the prosecution of asylum seekers for unauthorised crossing of the border fence is likely to be at variance with obligations under international and EU law.¹⁹

¹⁴ On the temporary reception centres, see AIDA, Country Report Serbia, 2017 Update, February 2018, available at: <http://bit.ly/2Gvg06U>, 37.

¹⁵ See e.g. Council of Europe Lanzarote Committee, *Special report further to a visit to transit zones at the Serbian/Hungarian border*, T-ES(2017)11, 30 January 2018, available at <http://bit.ly/2C6bYyZ>, 13.

¹⁶ Article 6(2) recast Asylum Procedures Directive.

¹⁷ Council of Europe, *Report of the fact-finding mission by Ambassador Tomáš Boček, Special Representative of the Secretary General on migration and refugees to Serbia and two transit zones in Hungary*, 12-16 June 2017, available at <http://bit.ly/2nLosa8>.

¹⁸ See Section 301(6) Act CCXL of 2013 on the implementation of criminal punishments and measures, and Sections 51 and 52 Act II of 2007 on the entry and residence of third-country nationals. See also Section 59(2) Criminal Code, which provides that: "Persons granted asylum may not be expelled."

¹⁹ UNHCR, *Hungary as a country of asylum*, May 2016, available at: <http://bit.ly/1XmHUGA>, paras 60-62.

The criminalisation of illegal entry targeting asylum seekers ceased to be of relevance with the 5 July 2016 entry into force of the “8-km rule” discussed below. Between 15 September 2015 and 10 July 2016, over 2,800 criminal procedures started at the Szeged Criminal Court under the new Criminal Code for illegally crossing the border fence. In 2,843 cases the decisions became final. Since 10 July 2016, only seven cases have been tried for “illegally crossing the border fence”. In 2017, no such case was reported.

Legal amendments that entered into force on 5 July 2016 allowed the Hungarian police to automatically push back asylum seekers who were apprehended within 8 km of the Serbian-Hungarian or Croatian-Hungarian border to the external side of the border fence, without registering their data or allowing them to submit an asylum claim, in a summary procedure lacking the most basic procedural safeguards (e.g. access to an interpreter or legal assistance).²⁰ Legalising push backs from deep within Hungarian territory denies asylum seekers the right to seek international protection, in breach of international and EU law,²¹ and according to the HHC constitutes a violation of Article 4 of Protocol 4 of the European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR). Those pushed back have no practical opportunities to file a complaint. As a result of the legalisation of push-backs by the “8-km rule”, in the period of 5 July and 31 December 2016, 19,057 migrants were denied access (prevented from entering or escorted back to the border) at the Hungarian-Serbian border.²² These migrants were not only denied the right to apply for international protection, despite most of them coming from war zones such as Syria, Iraq or Afghanistan, but many of them were also physically abused by personnel in uniforms and injured as a consequence. Two HHC cases on collective expulsion addressing the unlawful push backs were recently communicated by the European Court of Human Rights (ECtHR).²³

One of the key elements of the amendments that entered into force on 28 March 2017 is that when the state of crisis due to mass migration is in effect, irregularly staying migrants found anywhere in Hungary are to be escorted to the external side of the border fence with Serbia, thus extending the 8-km zone to the entire territory of Hungary. This includes the migrants who have never even been to Serbia before and have entered Hungary through Ukraine or Romania. In 2017, 9,136 migrants were pushed back from the territory of Hungary to the external side of the border fence and 10,964 migrants were blocked entry at the border fence.²⁴

Since 5 July 2016, the HHC and other organisations working with migrants and refugees, including UNHCR and MSF, have received reports and documented hundreds of individual cases of violence perpetrated against would-be asylum seekers on and around the Hungarian-Serbian border. Common to these accounts is the indiscriminate nature of the violence and the claim that the perpetrators wore uniforms consistent with the Hungarian police and military. The best known case is that of a young Syrian man who drowned in the river Tisza while attempting to cross into Hungary on 1 June 2016.²⁵ His surviving brother is represented by the HHC and since a criminal investigation in relation to the tragic incident has been closed, the case is now pending at the ECtHR.²⁶ The fact that violence against potential asylum seekers is on the rise is further testified by the report of Human Rights Watch, published on 13 July 2016, citing various testimonies about brutality against migrants at the border.²⁷ Amnesty International researchers interviewed 18 people who entered Hungary irregularly in an attempt to claim asylum, often in groups, and who were pushed back, several violently. None of them had their individual situation assessed to determine the risks to the person or establish their asylum needs first.

²⁰ HHC, *Hungary: Access denied*, Information Note, 14 July 2016, available at: <https://goo.gl/tEMB9O>.

²¹ *Ibid.*

²² HHC, *Key asylum figures as of 1 January 2017*, available at: <https://goo.gl/KdTy4V>.

²³ ECtHR, *Khurram v. Hungary*, Application No 12625/17; *H.K. v. Hungary*, Application No 18531/17, Communicated on 21 December 2017.

²⁴ HHC, *Key asylum figures as of 1 January 2018*, available at: <http://bit.ly/2mkueyK>.

²⁵ UNHCR, ‘UNHCR alarmed at refugee death on Hungary-Serbia border’, 6 June 2016, available at: <https://goo.gl/T20fj9>.

²⁶ ECtHR, *Alhowais Abdullah Mohamed v. Hungary*, Application No 59435/17.

²⁷ Human Rights Watch, ‘Hungary: Migrants abused at the border’, 13 July 2016, available at: <http://bit.ly/29xIOuU>; ‘Hungary: Failing to Protect Vulnerable Refugees’, 20 September 2016, available at: <https://goo.gl/aP7Pjs>.

They were all sent back to Serbia across the border fence – sometimes through the hole they had cut themselves, sometimes through service doors – without any formal procedure. Most of them were informed in English that they needed to wait to enter the “transit zones”, if they wished to seek asylum in Hungary, and that this is the only lawful way to enter the country. Some of the interviewees reported that they were shown an information note in their own language, advising them of the same. Most of them were photographed or filmed by police.²⁸ The doctors of MSF in Serbia treat injuries caused by Hungarian authorities on a daily basis. This shocking reality is evidenced by a set of video testimonies recorded by a Hungarian news portal on 24 August 2016 in English.²⁹ A Frontex spokesperson has described the situation in an article of the French newspaper *Libération* on 18 September 2016 as “well-documented abuses on the Hungary-Serbia border”.³⁰ UNHCR also expressed its concerns about Hungary pushing asylum seekers back to Serbia.³¹ In 2017 the following reports addressing these issues were published: an HHC report published jointly with regional partners entitled “Pushed Back at the Door”,³² the Oxfam report “A Dangerous ‘game’”,³³ the MSF report “Games of violence”,³⁴ and the report of the fact-finding mission by Ambassador Tomáš Boček, Special Representative of the Secretary General on migration and refugees to Serbia and two transit zones in Hungary.³⁵

In light of the unprecedented number of reports about violence committed around the Hungarian-Serbian border, the HHC sent an official letter to the Police, urging investigations into the allegations already made on 14 June 2016.³⁶ The letter referred to, among others, testimonies given by unaccompanied minor asylum seekers, who told the HHC that the Hungarian Police hit and kicked them, and used gas spray against them. One of these children had visible injuries on his nose that he claimed were the result of an attack by a police dog released on him after he had been apprehended. The HHC requested that the Police launch an investigation immediately, and that steps be taken to ensure that police measures are lawful in all cases. On 23 June 2016, the Police responded by claiming that they “guarantee humane treatment and the insurance of fundamental human rights in all cases”. The letter failed to address any of the reported abuses but promised to “pay particular attention” to instruct those on duty at and around the border to guarantee the lawfulness of police measures.³⁷

Despite the fact that as many as 56 reports on abuse committed against migrants at the border have been filed and that the prosecutor’s office has launched 50 investigations, so far only one member of the police and one member of the army have been convicted (fined) in court.³⁸

2. Registration of the asylum application

Indicators: Registration

1. Are specific time limits laid down in law for asylum seekers to lodge their application? ☐ Yes ☒ No
2. If so, what is the time limit for lodging an application?

²⁸ Amnesty International, *Stranded hope: Hungary’s sustained attack on the rights of refugees and migrants*, September 2016, available at: <https://goo.gl/SK9RVd>.

²⁹ HVG, ‘Hat év a tranzitónában? Akkor inkább az illegális út – riport a határról’, 24 August 2016, available in Hungarian at: <https://goo.gl/SR8rEY>.

³⁰ *Libération*, ‘A la frontière serbe, Frontex s’embourbe dans la galère hongroise’, 18 September 2016, available in French at: <https://goo.gl/U7LwHv>.

³¹ UNHCR, ‘UNHCR concerned Hungary pushing asylum seekers back to Serbia’, 15 July 2016, available at: <https://goo.gl/T6GxCZ>.

³² HHC et al., *Pushed back at the door: Denial of access to asylum in Eastern EU Member States*, 2017, available at: <http://bit.ly/2jxcdLd>.

³³ Oxfam et al., *A dangerous ‘game’: The pushback of migrants, including refugees, at Europe’s borders*, April 2017, available at: <http://bit.ly/2oGwxQ9>.

³⁴ MSF, *Games of violence*, October 2017, available at: <http://bit.ly/2Hy4edo>.

³⁵ Council of Europe, *Report of the fact-finding mission by Ambassador Tomáš Boček, Special Representative of the Secretary General on migration and refugees to Serbia and two transit zones in Hungary*, 12-16 June 2017, available at <http://bit.ly/2nLosa8>.

³⁶ HHC, *Letter to the Hungarian Police*, 14 June 2016, available in Hungarian at: <https://goo.gl/AeLGzN>.

³⁷ See the Police’s response in Hungarian at: <http://bit.ly/29EdbiN>.

³⁸ 444, ‘A Honvédség és a rendőrség egy-egy beosztottját ítéltek el eddig, mert migránsokat bántalmazott’, 25 August 2017, available in Hungarian at: <http://bit.ly/2Fjee9E>.

There is no time limit for lodging an asylum application, but since applications can only be lodged in the transit zones (except for those lawfully staying in the territory), the asylum seekers entering the transit zone are asked immediately whether they wish to apply for asylum. If they for some reason do not wish to do so, they are immediately escorted back through the gate of the transit zone.

The application should be lodged in writing or orally and in person by the person seeking protection at the IAO.³⁹ If the person lawfully staying in Hungary seeking protection appears before another authority to lodge an application for asylum, that authority should inform the asylum seeker about where to turn to with his or her application. If the asylum claim is made in the course of immigration, petty offence or criminal procedures e.g. at the border or in detention, the proceeding authority (police, Immigration Department of the IAO, local authorities or court) must record the statement and forward it to the asylum authority without delay.

Numbers of applications for international protection are presented below:

Asylum applicants in Hungary					
Year	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Number	18,900	42,777	177,135	29,432	3,397

Source: IAO

³⁹ Section 80/I(b) and 80/J(1) Asylum Act.

C. Procedures

1. Regular procedure

As of 28 March 2017, asylum applications can only be submitted in the transit zones and all asylum seekers, excluding unaccompanied children below the age of 14, have to stay at the transit zones for the whole duration of their asylum procedure. The asylum procedure in the transit zone is therefore a regular procedure and no longer a [Border Procedure](#).

The HHC has serious concerns regarding the legal status of the transit zones. The official government position, as communicated in the press, is that asylum seekers admitted to the transit zone are on “no man’s land”, and that persons who were admitted and later “pushed back” in the direction of Serbia have never really entered the territory of Hungary. Consequently, such “push backs” do not qualify as acts of forced return. This position has no legal basis, as there is no “no man’s land” in international law; furthermore, the concept of extraterritoriality of transit zones was clearly rejected by the ECtHR in the *Amuur* case.⁴⁰ The transit zone and the fence are on Hungarian territory and even those queuing in front of the transit zone’s door are standing on Hungarian soil – as also evidenced by border stones clearly indicating the exact border between the two states.⁴¹ On 14 March 2017, the ECtHR issued a long-awaited judgment in the HHC-represented *Ilias and Ahmed v. Hungary* case. The Court confirmed its established jurisprudence that confinement in the transit zones in Hungary amounts to unlawful detention and established the violation of Article 5(1), a violation of Article 5(4) and a violation of Article 13 in conjunction with Article 3 of the Convention due to the lack of effective remedy to complain about the conditions of detention in the transit zone. The government’s appeal against the judgment is currently pending at the Grand Chamber of the ECtHR.

1.1. General (scope, time limits)

Indicators: Regular Procedure: General

1. Time limit set in law for the determining authority to make a decision on the asylum application at first instance: 2 months
2. Are detailed reasons for the rejection at first instance of an asylum application shared with the applicant in writing? ☒ Yes ☐ No
3. Backlog of pending cases at first instance as of 31 December 2017: 678

The asylum procedure in Hungary starts with an assessment of whether a person falls under a Dublin procedure. If this is not the case, the IAO proceeds with examination of whether the application is inadmissible or whether it should be decided in accelerated procedure. The decision on this shall be made within 15 days.⁴²

The procedural deadline for issuing a decision on the merits is 60 days.⁴³ The recent amendment of Asylum Act entering into force on 1 January 2018 provides that the head of the IAO may extend this administrative time limit on one occasion before its expiry, by a maximum of 21 days. The following shall not count towards the administrative time limit:

- a. periods when the procedure is suspended,
- b. periods for remedying deficiencies and making statements,
- c. periods needed for the translation of the application and other documents,
- d. periods required for expert testimony,
- e. duration of the special authority’s procedure,

⁴⁰ ECtHR, *Amuur v. France*, Application No 19776/92, Judgment of 25 June 1996, para 52.

⁴¹ HHC, *No country for refugees*, Information Note, 18 September 2015; ECRE, *Crossing Boundaries: The new asylum procedure at the border and restrictions to accessing protection in Hungary*, October 2015, available at: <http://bit.ly/1NxI9IP>.

⁴² Section 47(2) Asylum Act.

⁴³ Section 47(3) Asylum Act.

- f. periods required to comply with a request.

It is too early to observe the application of this amendment in practice in 2018.

In 2017, the HHC observed that time limits were usually respected. The IAO issues the first decision in around 1.5 to 2 months. Syrians without any original ID document receive a decision even faster, in 3-4 weeks or sometimes sooner. However, the HHC is aware of several cases of families with children that were staying in the transit zone for months without any decision despite the deadline being 60 days. The cases of unaccompanied children that are supposed to be privileged under the law are also not always decided within the deadline. The HHC is aware of cases where children would be kept in the transit zone for more than 80 days without any decision.

There are cases outside the transit zones where HHC has seen long procedural times (up to almost 1 year). HHC observed the general practice that decisions were not notified in time (8 days, or 3 days after March 2017) after their issuance, which is contrary to the Asylum Act.⁴⁴

First instance decisions on the asylum application, are taken by so-called eligibility officers within the Refugee Directorate of the IAO. A decision of the IAO may:

- ❖ Grant refugee status;
- ❖ Grant subsidiary protection status;
- ❖ Grant tolerated status where *non-refoulement* prohibits the person's return; or
- ❖ Reject the application as inadmissible or reject it on the merits.

Amendments to the Asylum Act that entered into force on 1 January 2018 provide an additional ground for termination of the procedure that is unclear and its application could be problematic: "The refugee authority shall terminate the procedure if the client failed to submit any document requested by the refugee authority in time or failed to comply with the invitation to make a statement within the time limit and, in the absence of the document or statement, the application cannot be decided on."⁴⁵

In parallel with the rejection decision, the IAO also immediately expels the rejected asylum seeker and orders a ban on entry and stay for 1 or 2 years. This ban is entered into the Schengen Information System and prevents the person from entering the entire Schengen area in any lawful way.

In practice, the average length of an asylum procedure, including both the first-instance procedure conducted by the IAO and the judicial review procedure, is 3-6 months.

1.2. Prioritised examination and fast-track processing

According to Section 35(7) of the Asylum Act, the cases of unaccompanied children should be prioritised. However, this prioritisation is not applied in practice. According to HHC lawyers and attorneys working with unaccompanied children, in several cases the decision-making procedure took the same length as in the cases of adults and the IAO used up the 60 days or even prolonged the procedure in a few cases by 21 days, which is the maximum length of prolongation permitted by law.

For example in the case of an unaccompanied children who applied for asylum in December 2016, the decision was delivered in July 2017. The reason for prolongation was partly due to the fact that his caretaker had absconded, leaving the child behind, thus causing procedural difficulties in the case. However, in July 2017 a rejection was served to the child which was quashed by the court in September 2017. At the time of writing the current report, the repeated procedure had already exceeded 60 days and had been prolonged by 21 days.

⁴⁴ Section 80/K(3) Asylum Act.

⁴⁵ Section 32/I Asylum Act.

In case of an asylum seeker detained in an asylum detention or immigration jail, the asylum procedure shall be conducted as a matter of priority. This is usually applied in practice.⁴⁶ Note that transit zones are not considered detention by the Government, therefore the prioritisation does not apply there.

1.3. Personal interview

Indicators: Regular Procedure: Personal Interview

1. Is a personal interview of the asylum seeker in most cases conducted in practice in the regular procedure? ☒ Yes ☐ No
 - ❖ If so, are interpreters available in practice, for interviews? ☒ Yes ☐ No
2. In the regular procedure, is the interview conducted by the authority responsible for taking the decision? ☒ Yes ☐ No
3. Are interviews conducted through video conferencing? ☒ Frequently ☐ Rarely ☐ Never

The personal interview of the asylum seeker is mandatory in the asylum procedure. The IAO may omit the personal interview in the following cases, where the asylum seeker:⁴⁷

- (a) Is not fit for being heard;
- (b) Submitted a subsequent application and, in the application, failed to state facts or provided proofs that would allow the recognition as a refugee or beneficiary of subsidiary protection. The personal hearing cannot be dispensed with, if the subsequent application is submitted by a person seeking recognition whose application was submitted earlier on his/her behalf as a dependent person or an unmarried minor.

The asylum seeker has a first interview usually immediately upon the entry into the transit zone. During the asylum procedure, the asylum seeker can have one or more substantive interviews, where he or she is asked to explain in detail the reasons why he or she had to leave his or her country of origin. The HHC's lawyers observed that in **Békéscsaba** asylum detention asylum seekers (which is now closed) often underwent an excessive amount of interviews, 4, 5 or 6, in one case even 9. The HHC believes that the IAO did that in order to find contradictions in asylum seeker's statements to be able to reject his or her claim.

Interpretation

Section 36 of the Asylum Act and Section 66 of the Asylum Decree set out rules relating to the right to use one's native language in the procedure and on gender-sensitive interviewing techniques. A person seeking asylum may use their mother tongue or the language he or she understands orally and in writing during his or her asylum procedure. If the asylum application is submitted orally and the asylum seeker does not speak Hungarian, the asylum authority must provide an interpreter speaking the applicant's mother tongue or another language understood by that person. There may be no need for using an interpreter if the asylum officer speaks the mother tongue of that person or another language understood by him or her, and the asylum seeker consents in writing to not having an interpreter.

Where the applicant requests so, a same-sex interpreter and interviewer must be provided, where this is considered not to hinder the completion of the asylum procedure.⁴⁸ For asylum seekers who are facing gender-based persecution and make such a request, this designation is compulsory.⁴⁹ Amendments that entered into force on 1 January 2018 secure the right of the applicant to request a case officer and interpreter of the gender of his or her choice on grounds that his or her gender identity is different from the gender registered in the official database.⁵⁰ Nevertheless, the HHC is not aware of any gender or vulnerability-specific guidelines applicable to eligibility officers conducting interviews (see [Special Procedural Guarantees](#)).

⁴⁶ Section 35/A Asylum Act.

⁴⁷ Section 43 Asylum Act.

⁴⁸ Section 66(2) Asylum Decree.

⁴⁹ Section 66(3) Asylum Decree.

⁵⁰ Section 66(3a) Asylum Decree.

The costs of translation, including translations into sign language, are borne by the IAO.

There is no specific code of conduct for interpreters in the context of asylum procedures. Many interpreters are not professionally trained on asylum issues. There is no quality assessment performed on their work, nor are there any requirements in order to become an interpreter for the IAO. The IAO is obliged to select the cheapest interpreter from the list, even though his or her quality would not be the best. For example, in the **Vámosszabadi** refugee camp, the HHC lawyer reported that in all his cases regarding Nigerian clients, none of the English interpreters fully understood what the clients said; the lawyer had to help the interpreter. The same happened at the court. There was another case, where the interpreter did not speak English well enough to be able to translate; for example, he did not know the word “asylum”. In another case before the Budapest Labour Court, the interpreter was from Djibouti, and the client from Somalia did not understand her. The interpreter said the client was lying and the judge decided that there would be no interview. In another case the client claimed that he converted to Christianity and the interpreter was Muslim. He did not know the expressions needed for the interview, not even in Farsi, not to mention Hungarian; for example: disciples, Easter, Christmas and so on. The lawyer had to help him. In 2017 a HHC lawyer reported that an English interpreter was used in order to communicate the decision to the client, who could not properly speak English. The lawyer complained about this, nevertheless, the same interpreter was invited to the Court hearing in **Győr**, where after realising the low level of his English, the judge conducted the procedure with the HHC and IAO’s lawyers helping with the translation for the asylum seeker. It has also been reported that some interpreters tend to add their own comments to the story which can be either supporting or weakening the claim itself. It even happened that the interpreter would ask further questions on his own motion. A client reported to the HHC that the interpreter forced her to answer even though she did not know the answer to the question. Despite this, the interpreter insisted on getting some kind of answer out of her.

In **Békéscsaba**, the asylum detention centre which is now closed, Pakistani asylum seekers complained about the quality of Urdu spoken by their Afghan interpreter and Iranian asylum seekers complained about the quality of Persian spoken by their Afghan interpreter. When the **Bicske** refugee camp was still open, there was a case officer who could not properly write in Hungarian, so she had to be supported by the legal representatives of the asylum seekers. However, when there were no legal representatives present, mistakes were probably made by this case officer. The HHC lawyer also complained about a Chinese interpreter working with the IAO who made unwanted comments about the asylum seeker and this interpreter was later fired.

Moreover, the case officers are reluctant to phrase the questions or any information in a non-legalistic way so as to enable the client to understand what the case officer is talking about. If case officers were less formalistic, interpreters would have an easier task in the procedure. Interpreters also sometimes overstep their limits, for example by making comments such as that the asylum seeker comes from different part of a country, because the pronunciation is not used in the area he or she claims to be from.

Recording

Interviews are frequently conducted through video conferencing. It happens several times that there are more translators present in the same room in Budapest and having video conferences with asylum-seekers from the transit zones. On account of the noise it is hard to hear and to concentrate on what the interpreter says.

The HHC lawyer experience the following: A child asylum seeker was interviewed from the Röske transit zone through a “Skype interview”. The case officer, translator and the lawyer were at the other end of the line. The minor was sitting in a container in the transit zone. There were at least 2 IAO officers either present or walking in occasionally. Because of the heat, the door was open in the first 30 minutes and there was a policeman standing in front of the door; he could be seen in the camera. The guardian was also present, however he clearly never met the minor before. He was mainly interested in the minutes referring to the fact that he did his legal obligations. The picture quality was good, however

the asylum-seeker could only see the translator. Whenever the lawyer asked a question or tried to explain something to him, he tried to lean in so that the client could see him, but at the end of the day, there was still no way to read body-language. There was no information form prepared for the interview so the minor only received and signed it at the end of the interview.

Interviews are not recorded by audio-video equipment. The questions and statements are transcribed verbatim by the asylum officers conducting the interview. The interview transcript is orally translated by the interpreter to the asylum seeker who will have an opportunity to correct it before its finalisation and signature by all present persons. However, the HHC has observed that minutes of the interviews are systematically not read back to the asylum seekers in different locations, e.g. in **Békéscsaba** (which is now closed) and in the **Röszke** and **Tompa** transit zones. Furthermore, there was a case when the Afghan interpreter had so many interviews on the same day that she wanted to leave just before the read-back of the record. There are several cases where the courts would annul the IAO's first instance decision and to order a new procedure to be carried out due to the inadequate interviews.⁵¹

Amendments that entered into force on 1 January 2018 introduced a new procedural safeguard regarding the selection of interpreters. The IAO is required to take into account the possible differences / contrast in terms of the country of origin and the cultural background of the interpreter and that of the applicant, as indicated by the applicant to the authority.

1.4. Appeal

Indicators: Regular Procedure: Appeal

1. Does the law provide for an appeal against the first instance decision in the regular procedure?

❖ If yes, is it	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
❖ If yes, is it suspensive	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Judicial	<input type="checkbox"/> Administrative
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
2. Average processing time for the appeal body to make a decision: 2-4 months

A decision must be communicated orally to the person seeking asylum in his or her mother tongue or in another language he or she understands. Together with this oral communication, the decision shall also be made available to the applicant in writing, but only in Hungarian. The HHC's attorneys working at the transit zones and **Kiskunhalas** observe that most of decisions are not translated to the clients by interpreters. Instead the IAO uses case officers or even other clients to announce the main points of the decision. The justification for a decision reached is – apart from some exceptions - almost never explained to the asylum seeker.

Decisions taken by the IAO may be challenged in a single instance judicial review procedure only; there is no onward appeal. The Public Administrative and Labour Law Courts, organised at the level of regional courts (at the judicial second-instance level), have jurisdiction over asylum cases, which are dealt with by single judges. Judges are typically not asylum specialists, nor are they specifically trained in asylum law.

The deadline for lodging a request for judicial review is only 8 days.⁵² The drastic decrease of the time limit to challenge the IAO's decision, in force since 1 July 2013, has been sharply criticised by UNHCR and NGOs such as HHC, which have argued that this will jeopardise asylum seekers' access to an effective remedy.⁵³ For example, the short deadline is problematic when a person receives subsidiary protection and is not sufficiently informed about the opportunity to appeal and about the benefits the refugee status would bring him or her (e.g. possibility of family reunification under beneficial conditions). Within 8 days, it is sometimes impossible to meet a lawyer and the person might miss the deadline for

⁵¹ See e.g. Metropolitan Court, *S.M.R. v. Office of Immigration and Nationality*, 17.K.30.302/2010/18-II, 4 February 2011, available at: <http://bit.ly/2kMoA6Y>; Metropolitan Court, *S.W.J. v. Office of Immigration and Nationality*, 24.K.32 957/2009/23, 30 September 2010, available at: <http://bit.ly/2knDzGO>.

⁵² Section 68 Asylum Act.

⁵³ UNHCR, *UNHCR Comments and Recommendations on the Draft modification of certain migration-related legislative acts for the purpose of legal harmonisation*, 12 April 2013, available at: <http://bit.ly/1B8gZG5>, 14.

the appeal. Keeping the deadline has proven difficult in the case of unaccompanied minors since it often requires discussions with a lawyer and the arrangement of the minor's personal appearance before the asylum authority. The understaffed Children's Home in Fót may find it difficult to carry out these tasks on time. There was one case in 2017 when the Administrative and Labour Court of Budapest accepted the appeal of an unaccompanied minor, although it was submitted some 20 days late. The minor argued that the psychological burden of coping with the traumatic experiences in the Röszke transit zone and the time needed to settle in at his new place of stay prevented him from meeting the extremely short deadline.

The request for judicial review has suspensive effect.

Section 68(3) of the Asylum Act provides that the court should take a decision on the request for judicial review within 60 days. However, in practice, the appeal procedure takes a bit longer, around 3 months or even more, depending on the number of hearings the court holds in a case.

The hearing is only mandatory if the person is in detention. And even this is subject to some exceptions, where:⁵⁴

- (a) The applicant cannot be summoned from his or her place of accommodation;
- (b) The applicant has departed for an unknown destination; or
- (c) The appeal concerns a subsequent application presenting no new facts.

Interpreters are provided and paid for by the court.

Hearings in asylum procedures are public. Individual court decisions in asylum cases are published on the Hungarian court portal.⁵⁵ However, the personal data, including nationality, of the appellant are deleted from the published decisions.

The court carries out an assessment of both points of fact and law as they exist at the date when the court's decision is made (only *ex tunc* and not *ex nunc* examination). The court may not alter the decision of the refugee authority; it shall annul any administrative decision found to be against the law – with the exception of the breach of a procedural rule not affecting the merits of the case – and it shall order the refugee authority to conduct a new procedure if necessary.⁵⁶

There were 788 appeals submitted against the decisions of the IAO in 2017. In 276 cases the courts rejected the appeal of the asylum seekers while in 409 cases on the ground of the appeals the courts annulled the decisions of IAO and ordered them to conduct a new procedure. In 116 cases courts terminated the judicial procedure and in 42 cases rejected the appeals as inadmissible.⁵⁷

1.5. Legal assistance

Indicators: Regular Procedure: Legal Assistance

1. Do asylum seekers have access to free legal assistance at first instance in practice?

<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> With difficulty	<input type="checkbox"/> No
------------------------------	---	-----------------------------

 - ❖ Does free legal assistance cover:⁵⁸

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Representation in interview
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Legal advice

2. Do asylum seekers have access to free legal assistance on appeal against a negative decision in practice?

<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> With difficulty	<input type="checkbox"/> No
------------------------------	---	-----------------------------

 - ❖ Does free legal assistance cover

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Representation in courts
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Legal advice

⁵⁴ Section 68(4) Asylum Act.

⁵⁵ Asylum cases published on the Hungarian court portal are available in Hungarian at: <http://bit.ly/1IwxZWq>.

⁵⁶ Section 68(5) Asylum Act.

⁵⁷ Information provided by IAO, 12 February 2018.

⁵⁸ This refers both to state-funded and NGO-funded legal assistance.

Under Section 37(3) of the Asylum Act, asylum seekers in need have access to free legal aid according to the rules set out in the Act on Legal Aid Act or by an NGO registered in legal protection. The needs criterion is automatically met, given that asylum seekers are considered in need irrespective of their income or financial situation, merely on the basis of their statement regarding their income and financial situation.⁵⁹

The Legal Aid Act sets out the rules for free of charge, state-funded legal assistance provided to asylum seekers. Sections 4(b) and 5(2)(d) provide that asylum applicants are entitled to free legal aid if they are entitled to receive benefits and support under the Asylum Act. Section 3(1)(e) provides that legal aid shall be available to those who are eligible for it, as long as the person is involved in a public administrative procedure and needs legal advice in order to understand and exercise his or her rights and obligations, or requires assistance with the drafting of legal documents or any submissions. Legal aid is not available for legal representation during public administrative procedures. Therefore, in the asylum context, the presence of a legal representative during the asylum interview conducted by the IAO is not covered by the legal aid scheme. In the transit zones asylum seekers requesting assistance of lawyers at their first interview would get such assistance only occasionally, depending on whether the State legal aid lawyers are at that moment present in the transit zone. The interview would not be postponed in order to wait for the lawyer to arrive.

Section 13(b) of the Legal Aid Act also provides that asylum seekers may have free legal aid in the judicial review procedure contesting a negative asylum decision. Chapter V of the Legal Aid Act sets out rules on the availability of legal aid in the context of the provision of legal advice and assistance with drafting of legal documents for persons who are eligible for legal aid.

Section 37(4) of the Asylum Act provides that legal aid providers may attend the personal interview of the asylum seeker, have access to the documents produced in the course of the procedure and have access to reception and detention facilities to contact their client.

Legal aid providers may be attorneys, NGOs or law schools who have registered with the Legal Aid Service of the Judicial Affairs Office of the Ministry of Justice and Public Administration.⁶⁰ Legal aid providers may specify which main legal field they specialise in, i.e. whether in criminal law, or civil and public administrative law. As a general rule, beneficiaries of legal aid are free to select a legal aid provider of their own choice. This is facilitated by the legal aid offices around the country, which maintain lists and advise clients according to their specific needs.

Although asylum seekers have been eligible for free legal aid since 2004, very few have availed themselves of this opportunity due to several practical and legal obstacles. Firstly, with very few exceptions, asylum seekers are not aware of the legal aid system and do not seek the services of legal aid providers. Secondly, the legal aid system does not cover translation and interpretation costs, hence the opportunity to seek legal advice in the asylum procedure is rendered almost impossible. In addition, most Hungarian lawyers based in towns where reception and detention facilities are located do not speak foreign languages.

The HHC lawyers or any other non-government affiliated lawyers do not have access to the transit zones. The HHC lawyers can only represent the clients if the asylum seekers explicitly communicate the wish to be represented by the HHC lawyer to the IAO and sign a special form. Once this form is received by the IAO, the HHC lawyers can meet the client – accompanied by police officers – in a special container located outside the living sector of the transit zone. This way the legal aid in the transit zone is seriously obstructed, as free legal advice does not reach everyone in the transit zone, but only those explicitly asking for it. Besides, it is impossible to obtain legal assistance by the HHC lawyer during the IAO interview, since the interview usually happens immediately when the person is admitted to the transit zone and therefore there is no opportunity to access a lawyer first. The phone signal in the

⁵⁹ Section 5(2)(d) Legal Aid Act.

⁶⁰ Chapter VIII Legal Aid Act.

transit zone is also very weak, which often obstructs the interpretation conducted by the phone during lawyer-client meetings.

Since mid-2017, the IAO has been enforcing a new legal approach regarding the representation of asylum seekers. According to Hungarian law, asylum seekers may be represented by persons whose capacity to act has not been limited by Court. The IAO however argues that asylum seekers may only be represented by attorneys, thereby excluding those lawyers who are not yet members of the Bar Association. This led to the IAO rejecting HHC non-attorney lawyers' authority forms and denying them the right to act on behalf of their clients. The HHC firmly believes that this practice is unlawful and is currently challenging it at the court.

Since 1 September 2016, the Legal Aid Service has been run by the Ministry of Interior. According to the data of the Ministry,⁶¹ asylum seekers before the IAO were granted state legal aid in 114 cases, while before the courts they were represented in 73 cases in 2016. According to the Ministry's letter, in the transit zones, 1,500 asylum seekers were granted oral legal aid. Given the large number of asylum seekers arriving to Hungary in 2016, state legal aid has covered an extremely low proportion of asylum seekers (5.7%). In 2017, state legal aid (including legal counselling and editing documents) was granted in 1,058 asylum cases, while asylum seekers were represented before the courts in 63 cases.⁶² State legal aid was provided to one third of the asylum seekers in the transit zones while before the courts less than 10% of asylum seekers were represented by state lawyers.

The low financial compensation for legal assistance providers is also an obstacle for lawyers and other legal assistance providers to engage effectively in the provision of legal assistance to asylum seekers.

In 2016, the HHC's lawyers provided legal counselling to 2,093 asylum seekers. In 477 cases the HHC's lawyers provided legal representation before the courts in asylum procedure, and in 37 cases they assisted beneficiaries of international protection in the [Family Reunification](#) procedure. Despite growing challenges the HHC continued to maintain presence at most venues where asylum-seekers and foreigners under return proceedings were being detained, including immigration and asylum jails, and the two land-border transit zones (where, since March 2017, the vast majority of asylum-seekers are held). In 2017 the HHC provided free-of-charge legal assistance to 1,679 asylum seekers and other forced migrants, remaining the only organisation offering such crucial help in Hungary. 234 HHC-represented clients received international protection in 2017, despite a massively hostile political and legal context. The HHC's clients had much higher statistical chance (50%) to be granted protection than the average (30%). 77% of HHC's asylum appeals were successful at court.

⁶¹ Information provided by the Ministry of Interior, 25 January 2017.

⁶² Information provided by the Ministry of Interior, 30 January 2018.

2. Dublin

2.1. General

The Dublin Coordination Unit has 18 IAO staff members.

Dublin statistics: 2017

Outgoing procedure			Incoming procedure		
	Requests	Transfers		Requests	Transfers
Total	896	220	Total	:	129
Bulgaria	689	93	Austria	:	78
Germany	109	76	Germany	:	30
Austria	37	:	Switzerland	:	11
Romania	:	14	:	:	:

Source: IAO

During 2016, a total 513 asylum seekers were transferred to Hungary under the Dublin Regulation, including 285 from Germany, 66 from Switzerland and 44 from Austria. In 2017, a total of 129 asylum seekers were transferred, primarily from Austria (78) and Germany (30).

Application of the Dublin criteria

The Dublin procedure is applied whenever the criteria of the Dublin Regulation are met, and most outgoing requests are issued based on the criteria of irregular entry or a previous application in another Member State. Whereas in 2016, the majority of the 5,619 outgoing requests issued by Hungary were addressed to Greece, most requests issued in 2017 concerned Bulgaria.

However, in one case the HHC represented in the asylum procedure an asylum seeker who was in a criminal procedure in Hungary and his family members were asylum seekers in Austria. The Hungarian Dublin Unit refused to start the Dublin procedure, saying that Dublin cannot be applied while the applicant is in a criminal procedure. After the intervention of the HHC lawyer, the Dublin Unit finally sent a take charge request to Austria, 1.5 month after his application for asylum. Due to the very slow procedure in Austria, the applicant could only join his family after 5.5 months since the start of the Dublin procedure.

There is no available information on the way the criteria are applied in practice. Asylum applications of unaccompanied minors with no family member or relative in EU are examined in Hungary. If an asylum seeker informs the IAO that he or she has a family member in another Member State, then the IAO would request a document proving the family link. Practice has lately become stricter because the IAO does not accept copies of documents anymore, but only originals. In case a DNA test is used, the costs should be borne by the applicant.

The Hungarian authorities refuse to apply Article 19(2) of the Dublin III Regulation, with regard to Bulgaria in cases of asylum seekers who have waited more than 3 months in Serbia before being admitted to the transit zone. According to Article 19(2) the responsibility of Bulgaria should have ceased in such situations, but the Hungarian authorities argue that this is not something that the applicants can rely on, but it can only be invoked by Bulgaria. Bulgaria in most cases either does not respond to Dublin request and therefore the responsibility is assumed, or it does not invoke Article 19(2).

The dependent persons and discretionary clauses

In 2016, Hungary sent 13 requests to other Member States to examine asylum applications based on the application of the “humanitarian” clause from which in 8 cases the other Member State accepted its responsibility, while in 3 cases the requests were rejected. In two other cases, the Member States applied other provisions of the Dublin III Regulation.⁶³ Hungary decided in a total of 227 cases to examine an application for international protection itself.⁶⁴

In 2017, Hungary established the responsibility of other Member States in 2 cases under the “humanitarian clause”. Pursuant to the humanitarian clause of Dublin Regulation 14 requests by other Member States were sent to Hungary in 2017. There were no cases in 2017 where “sovereignty clause” or the dependent persons clause were applied.⁶⁵

The IAO’s practice does not have any formal criteria defining the application of the sovereignty clause. The sovereignty clause is not applied in a country-specific manner; cases are examined on a case-by-case basis.

2.2. Procedure

Indicators: Dublin: Procedure

1. On average, how long does a transfer take after the responsible Member State has accepted responsibility?⁶⁶ Varies from case to case

Asylum seekers are systematically fingerprinted and their data is stored in Eurodac by the police authorities. However, during the large-scale influx of asylum seekers in 2015 and 2016, the IAO did not have the capacity to systematically store the fingerprints of those applying for asylum under the “asylum seeker” category (“Category 1”) in Eurodac, in particular in case large groups have been apprehended at the same time. The police authorities stored the fingerprints of those apprehended under the category of “irregular migrants” (“Category 2 and 3”) in the Eurodac system.

Some asylum seekers reported in 2015 that they were forced to give fingerprints. They reported that they were denied water until they agreed to give fingerprints. No such cases were reported in 2016 or 2017. Where an asylum seeker refuses to have his or her fingerprints taken, this can be a ground for an accelerated procedure,⁶⁷ or the IAO may proceed with taking a decision on the merits of the application without conducting a personal interview.⁶⁸

If a Dublin procedure is initiated, the procedure is suspended until the issuance of a decision determining the country responsible for examining the asylum claim,⁶⁹ subject to no possibility of legal challenge.⁷⁰ Even though a Dublin procedure can also be started after the case has been referred to the in-merit asylum procedure, Dublin procedures can no longer be initiated once the IAO has taken a decision on the merits of the asylum application. Finally, the apprehension of an irregular migrant can also trigger the application of the Dublin III Regulation.

⁶³ Articles 8(1) and 18(1)(b) Dublin III Regulation: Information provided by the IAO, January 2017.

⁶⁴ Once in relation to **Germany**, at another time regarding **Bulgaria** and in 225 cases the IAO examined the application in relation to **Greece**: Information provided by the IAO, 12 February 2018.

⁶⁵ Information provided by IAO, 12 February 2018.

⁶⁶ For example in cases of unaccompanied children Norway was proven to be very fast (a week) and Germany also quite fast (2-3 weeks). Austria on the other hand is very slow and transfers to Bulgaria can take longer as well.

⁶⁷ Section 51(7)(i) Asylum Act.

⁶⁸ Section 66(2)(f) Asylum Act.

⁶⁹ Section 49(2) Asylum Act.

⁷⁰ Section 49(3) Asylum Act.

Individualised guarantees

The IAO reports that it notes the existence of vulnerability factors already in the request sent to the other EU Member State and, if necessary, asks for individual guarantees. Nonetheless, the IAO does not have any statistics on the number of requests of individual guarantees. The request of individual guarantees concerns the treatment and the accommodation – especially the possibility of detention – of the transferred person. The inquiry furthermore includes questions about access to the asylum procedure, legal aid, medical and psychological services and about the appropriateness of material reception conditions.

According to HHC's experience with Dublin cases concerning Bulgaria, the Dublin Unit has asked the Bulgarian Dublin Unit in several cases to provide information on the general reception conditions for Dublin returnees, but these questions did not include individual characteristics of the persons concerned, so no questions were asked regarding specific needs of specific individuals. All Dublin decisions then contain a standard generic reply from the Bulgarian Dublin Unit. This would therefore constitute general information rather than individual guarantees.

Transfers

If another EU Member State accepts responsibility for the asylum applicant, the IAO has to issue a decision on the transfer within 8 days, and this time limit is complied with in practice.⁷¹ Once the IAO issues a Dublin decision ("resolution"), the asylum seeker can no longer withdraw his or her asylum application.⁷²

All asylum seekers, including asylum seekers under Dublin procedure, except minors below 14 years of age are held in transit zones for the whole duration of the asylum procedure (including Dublin procedure).

The transfer procedure to the responsible Member State is organised by the Dublin Unit of the IAO, in cooperation with the receiving Member State, but the actual transfer is performed by the police. In case of air transfer, the police assist with boarding the foreigner on the airplane, and – if the foreigner's behaviour or his or her personal circumstances such as age do not require it – the foreigner travels without escorts. Unaccompanied minors travel with their legal guardian who hands them over to the authorities of the receiving Member State. Otherwise the person will be accompanied by Hungarian police escorts. In case of land transfers, the staff of the police hand over the foreigner directly to the authorities of the other state. According to HHC's experience, voluntary transfers are rare. There is no official information on the duration of the transfer.

In 2016, Hungary issued 5,619 outgoing requests and carried out 213 transfers, thereby indicating a 3.8% transfer rate. In 2017, Hungary issued 896 outgoing requests and carried out 220 transfers, thereby indicating a 24.5% transfer rate.

2.3. Personal interview

Indicators: Dublin: Personal Interview

☐ Same as regular procedure

1. Is a personal interview of the asylum seeker in most cases conducted in practice in the Dublin procedure?
☐ Yes ☒ No
❖ If so, are interpreters available in practice, for interviews? ☒ Yes ☐ No
2. Are interviews conducted through video conferencing? ☒ Frequently ☐ Rarely ☐ Never

⁷¹ Section 83(3) Asylum Decree.

⁷² Section 49(4) Asylum Act.

There is no special interview conducted in the Dublin procedure. The information necessary for the Dublin procedure is obtained in the first interview with the IAO, upon submission of asylum application, but usually only in relation to the way of travelling and family members. According to the HHC, this is contrary to Articles 4 and 5 of the Dublin Regulation.

According to the HHC's experience, asylum seekers are rarely asked about the reasons for leaving another EU Member State. This is particularly problematic because the IAO takes the decision on transfer without being aware of any potential problems that the applicant could have experienced in the responsible Member State. This problem further escalates at the appeal stage since there the hearing is excluded by law. Therefore asylum seekers never actually get a chance to explain why they believe return to a responsible Member State would violate their rights. In one case for example, the applicant did not even have a regular interview, the IAO only checked his fingerprints and issued a Dublin transfer decision for **Greece**. The case reached the Court only after 8 months because of the delay in communication of the Dublin decision to the applicant and finally the court quashed the decision due to the procedural mistakes.⁷³ In another case the applicant was asked during the interview about Serbia and informed that Serbia is considered as a safe third country and that he had 3 days to submit the additional evidence why his return to Serbia would not be safe. After that the applicant received a Dublin decision ordering his transfer to Greece.

2.4. Appeal

Indicators: Dublin: Appeal

☐ Same as regular procedure

1. Does the law provide for an appeal against the decision in the Dublin procedure?

❖ If yes, is it

❖ If yes, is it suspensive

☒ Yes

☒ Judicial

☐ Yes

☐ No

☐ Administrative

☒ No

Asylum seekers have the right to request judicial review of a Dublin decision before the competent Regional Administrative and Labour Court within 3 days.⁷⁴ The extremely short time limit of 3 days for challenging a Dublin transfer does not appear to reflect the "reasonable" deadline for appeal under Article 27(2) of the Dublin III Regulation or the right to an effective remedy under Article 13 ECHR.⁷⁵ The HHC's attorney has observed that sometimes in **Békéscsaba**, an asylum detention centre now closed, the IAO did not inform the asylum seeker of the 3-day deadline for a judicial review.

The request for review shall be submitted to the IAO. The IAO shall forward the request for review, together with the documents of the case and its counter-application, to the court with no delay.⁷⁶ In practice however, the HHC has observed cases where the Dublin Unit of the IAO only forwarded the appeals to the court after several months. This significantly prolonged already very long Dublin procedures. For example in one case, the Dublin Unit waited 5 months before forwarding the appeal of an Afghan family, whose husband was seriously traumatised. HHC as well as UNHCR raised these problems with the IAO and finally the head of the Dublin Unit was replaced. The HHC observes that since the end of 2016 the appeals are forwarded to the court faster. In 2017 no such problems were observed.

The court can examine points of fact and law of the case, however only on the basis of available documents. This has been interpreted by the courts as precluding them from accepting any new evidence that were not submitted to the IAO already. This kind of interpretation makes legal representation in such cases meaningless, since the court's assessment is based on the laws and facts

⁷³ Metropolitan Court, Decision No 35.Kpk.46.367/2016/6.

⁷⁴ Section 49(7) Asylum Act.

⁷⁵ UNHCR has also criticised the effectiveness of Dublin appeals, citing CJEU, Case C-69/10 *Diouf*, Judgment of 28 July 2011, paras 66-68. See UNHCR, *UNHCR Comments and recommendations on the draft modification of certain migration, asylum-related and other legal acts for the purpose of legal harmonisation*, January 2015, available at: <http://bit.ly/1GvunEz>, 20.

⁷⁶ Section 49(7) Asylum Act.

as they stood at the time of the IAO's decision and the court does not at all examine the country information on the quality of the asylum system and reception conditions for asylum seekers in responsible Member State submitted by the asylum seeker's representative in the judicial procedure. The court has to render a decision within 8 calendar days.⁷⁷ In practice, however, it can take a few months for the court to issue a decision.

A personal hearing is specifically excluded by law; therefore there is no oral procedure.⁷⁸ This is particularly problematic since the asylum seeker is usually not asked in the interview by the IAO about the reasons why he or she left the responsible Member State and, since the court does not hold a hearing, this information never reaches the court either.

Appeals against Dublin decisions do not have suspensive effect. Asylum seekers have the right to ask the court to suspend their transfer. Contrary to the Dublin III Regulation,⁷⁹ according to the TCN Act and Asylum Act this request does not have suspensive effect either.⁸⁰ However, the Director-General of the IAO issued an internal instruction, stating that if a person requests for suspensive effect, the transfer should not be carried out until the court decides on the request for suspensive effect.⁸¹ However, it seems worrying that despite the clear violation of the Dublin III Regulation, the controversial provision was not amended in the scope of the several recent amendments of the Asylum Act.

The HHC's experience shows that the courts often do not assess the reception conditions in the receiving country, nor the individual circumstances of the applicant. Further on, the court decisions were often delivered by the court clerk and not the judge. However, this has changed from 2018, since according to the new amendments the clerks can no longer issue judgments.⁸²

2.5. Legal assistance

Indicators: Dublin: Legal Assistance

☒ Same as regular procedure

1. Do asylum seekers have access to free legal assistance at first instance in practice?

<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> With difficulty	<input type="checkbox"/> No
------------------------------	---	-----------------------------

 - ❖ Does free legal assistance cover:

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Representation in interview
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Legal advice

2. Do asylum seekers have access to free legal assistance on appeal against a Dublin decision in practice?

<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> With difficulty	<input type="checkbox"/> No
------------------------------	---	-----------------------------

 - ❖ Does free legal assistance cover

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Representation in courts
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Legal advice

Asylum seekers have the same conditions and obstacles to accessing legal assistance in the Dublin procedure as in the regular procedure (see section on [Regular Procedure: Legal Assistance](#)). What is particularly problematic for asylum seekers in the Dublin procedure are short deadlines (only 3 days to lodge an appeal) and the absence of a right to a hearing before the court. In such a short time it is hard to get access to legal assistance, which seems even more crucial since there is no right to a hearing. The importance of legal assistance is on the other hand seriously restricted since the courts are only performing an *ex tunc* examination and do not want to take into account any new evidence presented during the judicial review procedure.

⁷⁷ Section 49(8) Asylum Act.

⁷⁸ Section 49(8) Asylum Act.

⁷⁹ Article 27(3) Dublin III Regulation.

⁸⁰ Section 49(9) Asylum Act.

⁸¹ Information provided by the Dublin Unit based on the HHC's request, March 2014. See also EASO, *Description of the Hungarian asylum system*, May 2015, 6.

⁸² Section 94 of Act CXLI of 2017 amending certain acts relating to migration.

2.6. Suspension of transfers

Indicators: Dublin: Suspension of Transfers

1. Are Dublin transfers systematically suspended as a matter of policy or jurisprudence to one or more countries? ☒ Yes ☐ No
❖ If yes, to which country or countries? Greece

Greece

Until May 2016, because of the European Court of Human Rights (ECtHR)'s ruling in *M.S.S. v. Belgium and Greece*,⁸³ transfers to Greece have occurred only if a person consented to the transfer. However, in May 2016, the IAO started to issue Dublin decisions on returns to Greece again. The IAO was of the opinion that the *M.S.S.* case was no longer applicable, since Greece had received substantial financial support and the reception conditions in Greece were not worse than in some other EU countries. In some cases the HHC lawyers successfully challenged such decisions in the domestic courts and in two cases the HHC obtained Rule 39 interim measures from the ECtHR because the domestic courts confirmed the transfer decision of the IAO.⁸⁴ In both cases, the court decision was not issued by a judge but a court secretary. Both cases were struck out in 2017 because the applicants left Hungary and the Court was of the opinion that they are no longer at risk of being sent back to Greece because of the constrained resumption of Dublin transfers to Greece and the cautious treatment of transfers to Hungary.⁸⁵

At least since November 2015, several representatives of the Hungarian government also expressed the view that no Dublin transfers should take place from other Member States to Hungary as those who passed through Hungary must have entered the European Union for the first time in Greece.

However in December 2016 the practice changed again and no more Dublin transfer decisions to Greece are issued. The same is valid for 2017.

Bulgaria

Hungary has not suspended transfers to Bulgaria, even after UNHCR's call in January 2014 to temporarily suspend such transfers because of the risk of inhuman and degrading treatment due to systemic deficiencies in reception conditions and asylum procedures in Bulgaria.⁸⁶ The HHC lawyers in 2016 obtained two interim measures from the United Nations Human Rights Committee (UNHRC) regarding returns of persons with PTSD to Bulgaria.⁸⁷ In 2017 another interim measure was granted by the UNHRC, but the government did not respect the granted interim measure and deported the applicant to Bulgaria. All three cases are still pending.

The HHC is aware of a positive decision from the Szeged Court which stopped a transfer of an Iraqi family with four small children to Bulgaria under the Dublin III Regulation. The wife in the family was 8 months pregnant with the fifth child when the Szeged Administrative and Labour Court ruled on 3 July 2017 that due to her pregnancy, they were in need of special treatment and therefore their transfer to Bulgaria could jeopardize the life of the unborn baby and the wife, which lead the court to the conclusion that their transfer would be unlawful.⁸⁸

In another case a four-member Afghan family arrived to the transit zone in 2016 through Bulgaria where they had been fingerprinted. The IAO contacted the Bulgarian authorities regarding their transfer and the family was awaiting a decision. According to the regulations in place at that time, they were released

⁸³ ECtHR, *M.S.S. v. Belgium and Greece*, Application No 30696/09, Judgment of 21 January 2011.

⁸⁴ HHC, *Hungary: Update on Dublin transfers*, 14 December 2016, available at: <https://goo.gl/Fm00tF>.

⁸⁵ ECtHR, *M.S. v. Hungary*, Application No 64194/16 and *H.J. v. Hungary*, Application No 70984/16.

⁸⁶ See UNHCR, *UNHCR Observations on the Current Situation of Asylum in Bulgaria*, 2 January 2014, available at: <http://bit.ly/1dsMr2Y>.

⁸⁷ See e.g. Human Rights Committee, *B. v. Hungary*, Communication No 2901/2016, 9 December 2016.

⁸⁸ Administrative and Labour Court of Szeged, Decision No 11.Kpk.27.469/2017/12, 3 July 2017.

from the transit zone after 28 days and transferred to the open facility in Vámoszabadi. They left the facility for Austria and the family stayed in Vienna for six months. Following that, the Austrian authorities transferred the mother and one child to Bulgaria under the Dublin III Regulation. At that time, the woman was 7 months pregnant. The father and the other child continued their way to Germany, while the pregnant mother with a child was in Bulgaria. From there, she went back to Serbia with her child, where she gave birth. The mother and the two children stayed in Serbia for 8 months waiting to enter Hungary. They re-entered the transit zone on 11 July 2017, where she and the older child were considered as subsequent applicants, and thus according to the current legislation ineligible to receive any food, only shelter. It was only the new-born baby who could receive food. The breastfeeding mother and the small child had been starving in the transit zone for at least a week before the Baptists Charity started providing food for them. The Hungarian authorities wanted to send the mother and the two children to Germany under the Dublin Regulation, to be reunited with the father and the other child. The German authorities however informed the IAO that they intended to send the father and the child back to Bulgaria based on their fingerprints. Therefore, the Hungarian authorities decided to follow this example and sent a request to Bulgaria to take the family back. Bulgaria accepted responsibility. The mother with the two children was then released on 27 August 2017 from the transit zone and stayed in a semi-open community shelter in Balassagyarmat. In the meantime, the German authorities decided to recognise the father and the child in Germany as refugees. The HHC lawyer encouraged the Hungarian Unit to re-send the take charge request to Germany and on 16 November 2017 Germany accepted responsibility for the mother and the two children.

In the case where the transfer is suspended, Hungary assumes responsibility for examining the asylum application and the asylum seeker has the same rights as any other asylum seeker.

2.7. The situation of Dublin returnees

The amendments to the Asylum Act adopted from 2015 until 2017 have imposed some serious obstacles to asylum seekers who are transferred back to Hungary under the Dublin Regulation with regard to re-accessing the asylum procedure.

The following situations are applicable to Dublin returnees:

- (a) Persons who had not previously applied in Hungary and persons whose applications are still pending are both treated as first-time asylum applicants.
- (b) For persons whose applications are considered to have been tacitly withdrawn (i.e. they left Hungary and moved on to another EU Member State) and the asylum procedure had been terminated, the asylum procedure may be continued if the person requests such a continuation within 9 months of the withdrawal of the original application.⁸⁹ Where that time limit has expired, the person is considered to be a subsequent applicant (see section on [Subsequent Applications](#)). However, imposing a deadline in order for the procedure to be continued is contrary to the Dublin III Regulation, as the second paragraph of Article 18(2) states that when the Member State responsible had discontinued the examination of an application following its withdrawal by the applicant before a decision on the substance has been taken at first instance, that Member State shall ensure that the applicant is entitled to request that the examination of his or her application be completed or to lodge a new application for international protection, which shall not be treated as a subsequent application as provided for in the recast Asylum Procedures Directive. This is also recalled in Article 28(3) of the Recast Asylum Procedures Directive, which explicitly provides that the aforementioned 9-month rule on withdrawn applications “shall be without prejudice to [the Dublin III Regulation].”
- (c) Persons who withdraw their application in writing cannot request the continuation of their asylum procedure upon return to Hungary; therefore they will have to submit a subsequent application and present new facts or circumstances. [Subsequent Applications](#) raise several issues, not least

⁸⁹ Section 66(6) Asylum Act.

regarding exclusion from reception conditions. This is also not in line with above-described second paragraph of Article 18(2) of the Dublin III Regulation, which should be applied also in cases of explicit withdrawal in writing and not only in cases of tacit withdrawal.

- (d) The asylum procedure would also not continue, when the returned foreigner had previously received a negative decision and did not seek judicial review. This is problematic when the IAO issued a decision in someone's absence. The asylum seeker who is later returned under the Dublin procedure to Hungary will have to submit a subsequent application and present new facts and evidence in support of the application (see section on [Subsequent Applications](#)). According to Article 18(2) of the Dublin III Regulation, the responsible Member State that takes back the applicant whose application has been rejected only at the first instance shall ensure that the applicant has or has had the opportunity to seek an effective remedy against the rejection. According to the IAO, the applicant only has a right to request a judicial review in case the decision has not yet become legally binding. Since a decision rejecting the application becomes binding once the deadline for seeking judicial review has passed without such a request being submitted, the HHC believes that the Hungarian practice is in breach of the Dublin III Regulation because in such cases Dublin returnee applicants are not afforded an opportunity to seek judicial review after their return to Hungary.
- (e) All asylum seekers returned under Dublin will be placed in the transit zone and will have to remain there until the end of their asylum procedure.

Another problem that Dublin returnees face is an imminent interview upon arrival. Several asylum seekers complained to the HHC that they are too tired and not in a position to be focused during such interview just after the transfer that often occurs in late hours. On the other hand, the HHC is aware of the cases where Dublin returnees only had their first interview after several months since their return to Hungary, which is also not appropriate.

Since the enactment of legislative amendments to the Asylum Act in 2015 and 2017 and ensuing practice, administrative authorities and courts in at least 15 countries have ruled against Dublin transfers to Hungary. At least 8 countries (Austria, Czech Republic, Finland, Germany, Italy, the Netherlands, Slovakia, United Kingdom) have suspended transfers to Hungary as a matter of policy.⁹⁰ In 2017 UNHCR also released a statement on halting Dublin transfers to Hungary.⁹¹

3. Admissibility procedure

3.1. General (scope, criteria, time limits)

The admissibility of an application should be decided within 15 calendar days and this deadline may not be extended; there is no longer a separate admissibility procedure.

Under Section 51(2) of the Asylum Act, an application is inadmissible where:

- (a) The applicant is an EU citizen;
- (b) The applicant was granted international protection by another EU Member State;
- (c) The applicant is recognised as a refugee by a third country and protection exists at the time of the assessment of the application and the third country is prepared to readmit him or her;
- (d) The application is repeated and no new circumstance or fact occurred that would suggest that the applicant's recognition as a refugee or beneficiary of subsidiary protection is justified; or
- (e) There exists a country in connection with the applicant which qualifies as a [Safe Third Country](#) for him or her.

⁹⁰ For an overview of related case law, see HHC, *Summary of bans on / stopping of Dublin returns to Hungary*, 14 December 2016, available at: <https://goo.gl/1FhQ5R>.

⁹¹ UNHCR, 'UNHCR urges suspension of transfers of asylum-seekers to Hungary under Dublin', 10 April 2017, available at: <http://bit.ly/2ElcF3R>.

The “safe third country” concept may only be applied as an inadmissibility ground where the applicant (a) stayed or (b) travelled there and had the opportunity to request effective protection; (c) has relatives there and may enter the territory of the country; or (d) has been requested for extradition by a safe third country.⁹² In the event of applying the “safe third country” concept, the applicant, when this fact is communicated to him or her, can declare immediately but within 3 days at the latest why in his or her individual case, the specific country does not qualify as a safe third country.⁹³

The fact is that since 15 September 2015, Serbia is not taking back third-country nationals under the readmission agreement except for those who hold valid travel / identity documents and are exempted from Serbian visa requirements. Therefore actual returns to Serbia are not possible. Between January- and November 2016, only 182 irregular migrants were officially returned to Serbia. Neither the refusal of the asylum applications in the transit zones, nor the “legalised” push-backs since 5 July 2016 result in such official readmissions. Among the readmitted persons, there were 84 Serbian, 35 Kosovar and 27 Albanian citizens. None of the returnees were Syrian, Afghan, Iraqi or Somali citizens.⁹⁴ Despite this fact, the IAO still issued inadmissibility decisions based on safe third country grounds. In 2017, the IAO stopped issuing inadmissibility decisions based on safe third country grounds. The reasons for the change in practice are not known.

In case the application is declared inadmissible on safe third country grounds, the IAO shall issue a certificate in the official language of that third country to the applicant that his or her application for asylum was not assessed on the merits.⁹⁵ This guarantee was respected in practice.

Where the safe third country fails to take back the applicant, the refugee authority shall withdraw its decision and continue the procedure.⁹⁶ This provision was not respected in practice. Even though it was clear that Serbia would not accept back asylum seekers from Hungary, the IAO did not automatically withdraw the inadmissibility decision, but the person needed to apply for asylum again. According to the HHC’s experience asylum seekers had to go through the admissibility assessment for two or even three times and only after submitting the third or fourth asylum application would their case not be declared inadmissible. This resulted in extremely lengthy procedures which left people in great despair. Sometimes asylum seekers would be even detained after receiving a final rejection based on Serbia being a safe third country, despite the fact that deportations to Serbia were not taking place. The argument of the IAO was that Serbia could at any time start respecting the readmission agreement and therefore the return would become possible.

The IAO issued inadmissibility decisions based on Serbia being a safe third country also to vulnerable applicants, for example transsexuals from Cuba, disabled or single women victims of sexual and gender based violence. In a case of an extremely vulnerable single woman from Cameroon, who was a victim of trafficking in Serbia, held in hostage and raped several times, the HHC obtained an interim measure from the UN Human Rights Committee (UNHRC),⁹⁷ and after that her case was finally decided on the merits. The case is still pending at the UNHRC. In the case of *Ilias and Ahmed v. Hungary* the Court found a violation of Article 3 ECHR in respect of the applicants’ return to Serbia based on safe third country grounds, because of the exposure to the risk of chain-refoulement. The government’s appeal against the judgment is currently pending at the Grand Chamber of the ECtHR.

Article 33(2)(e) of the recast Asylum Procedures Directive, providing that an application by a dependant of the applicant who has consented to his or her case being part of an application made on his or her behalf, has not been transposed into Hungarian legislation.

⁹² Section 51(4) Asylum Act.

⁹³ Section 51(11) Asylum Act.

⁹⁴ HHC, *Key asylum figures as of 1 January 2017*, available at: <https://goo.gl/KdTy4V>.

⁹⁵ Section 51(6) Asylum Act.

⁹⁶ Section 51A Asylum Act.

⁹⁷ UN Human Rights Committee, Communication No 2768/2015.

3.2. Personal interview

There is no longer a separate procedure for admissibility, therefore the same rules as in the [Regular Procedure: Personal Interview](#) apply.

3.3. Appeal

Indicators: Admissibility Procedure: Appeal

☐ Same as regular procedure

1. Does the law provide for an appeal against the decision in the admissibility procedure?

- | | | |
|------------------------------|--|---|
| ❖ If yes, is it | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No |
| ❖ If yes, is it suspensive | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Judicial | <input type="checkbox"/> Administrative |
| ○ Safe third country grounds | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No |
| ○ Other grounds | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No |

The deadline for seeking judicial review against a negative decision on admissibility is shorter than in the regular procedure, as the request must be filed within only 7 calendar days.⁹⁸ The March 2017 amendment to the Asylum Act further shortened the appeal time to 3 calendar days. Judicial review is carried out by the same Regional Administrative and Labour Court that considers other asylum cases. The court's review shall include a complete examination of both the facts and the legal aspects, but only as they exist at the date when the authority's decision is made.⁹⁹ The applicant therefore cannot refer to new facts or new circumstances during the judicial review procedure. This also means that if the applicant did not present any country of origin information (COI) reports during the first instance procedure, or the IAO did not refer to these on their own, the applicant cannot present these reports at the judicial review procedure, despite the fact that these reports already existed before and were publicly available. A hearing is not mandatory; it only takes place "in case of need".¹⁰⁰ Moreover, the review procedure in admissibility cases differs from those rejected on the merits, since the court must render a decision within 8 days, instead of 60.

A request for judicial review against the IAO decision declaring an application inadmissible has no suspensive effect, except for judicial review regarding inadmissible applications based on safe third country grounds.¹⁰¹

The court may not alter the decision of the refugee authority; it shall annul any administrative decision found to be against the law, with the exception of the breach of a procedural rule not affecting the merits of the case, and it shall oblige the refugee authority to conduct a new procedure.¹⁰²

In practice, asylum seekers may face obstacles to lodging a request for judicial review against inadmissibility decisions for the following reasons:

- The 3-day deadline for applying for judicial review appears to be too short for an applicant to be able to benefit from qualified and professional legal assistance, and does not appear to satisfy the requirements of Article 13 ECHR on the right to an effective remedy.¹⁰³ Without a functioning and professional legal aid system available for asylum seekers, the vast majority of them have no access to legal assistance when they receive a negative decision from the IAO. Many asylum seekers may fail to understand the reasons for the rejection, especially in case of complicated legal arguments, such as the safe third country concept, and also lack awareness

⁹⁸ Section 53(3) Asylum Act.

⁹⁹ Section 53(4) Asylum Act.

¹⁰⁰ Section 53(4) Asylum Act.

¹⁰¹ Section 53(2) Asylum Act.

¹⁰² Section 53(5) Asylum Act.

¹⁰³ See e.g. ECtHR, *IM v France*, Application No 9152/09, Judgment of 2 February 2012; *Singh v Belgium*, Application No 33210/11, Judgment of 2 October 2012; *AC v Spain*, Application No 6258/11, Judgment of 22 April 2014. See also CJEU, *Diouf*, paras 66-68, finding that a 15-day time limit is not sufficient for preparing an appeal.

about their right to turn to court. The excessively short deadline makes it difficult for the asylum seeker to exercise her or his right to an effective remedy.

- The procedure is in Hungarian and the decision on inadmissibility is only translated once i.e. upon its communication to the applicant, in his or her mother tongue or in a language that the applicant may reasonably understand. This prevents the asylum seeker from having a copy of his or her own decision in a language he or she understands so that later he or she could recall the specific reasons why the claim was found inadmissible. The judge has to take a decision in 8 days on a judicial review request. The 8-day deadline for the judge to deliver a decision is insufficient for “a full and *ex nunc* examination of both facts and points of law” as prescribed by EU law (note that Hungarian legislation only allows for *ex tunc* review). Five or six working days are not enough for a judge to obtain crucial evidence (such as digested and translated country information, or a medical/psychological expert opinion) or to arrange a personal hearing with a suitable interpreter.
- The lack of an automatic suspensive effect on removal measures is in violation of the principle established in the consistent case-law of the European Court of Human Rights, according to which this is an indispensable condition for a remedy to be considered effective in removal cases. While rules under EU asylum law are more permissive in this respect and allow for the lack of an automatic suspensive effect in case of inadmissibility decisions and accelerated procedures, the lack of an automatic suspensive effect may still raise compatibility issues with the EU Charter of Fundamental Rights. The lack of an automatic suspensive effect is in clear violation of EU law with regard to standard procedures, as the Asylum Procedures Directive allows for this option only in certain specific (for example accelerated) procedures. In all cases where the suspensive effect is not automatic, it is difficult to imagine how an asylum seeker will be able to submit a request for the suspension of her/his removal as she/he is typically without professional legal assistance and subject to an unreasonably short deadline to lodge the request. To make it even worse for asylum seekers, the rules allowing for a request to grant a suspensive effect to be submitted are not found in the Asylum Act itself, but they emanate from general rules concerning civil court procedures. The amended Asylum Act lacks any additional safeguards for applicants in need of special procedural guarantees with regard to the automatic suspensive effect, although this is clearly required by EU law.
- Finally, asylum seekers often lack basic skills and do not understand the decision and the procedure to effectively represent their own case before the court, which only carries out a non-litigious procedure based on the files of the case and where an oral hearing is rather exceptional. Applicants are not informed that they have to specifically request a hearing in their appeal. The unreasonably short time limit and the lack of a personal hearing may reduce the judicial review to a mere formality, in which the judge has no other information than the documents provided by the IAO.

The European Commission launched an infringement procedure against Hungary for the violation of asylum-related EU law in December 2015, after a record fast preparatory process.¹⁰⁴ Regarding the asylum procedure, the Commission is concerned that there is no possibility to refer to new facts and circumstances in the context of appeals and that Hungary is not automatically suspending decisions in case of appeals, effectively forcing applicants to leave their territory before the time limit for lodging an appeal expires, or before an appeal has been heard. Further on, the Commission is also concerned as to the fact that, under the new Hungarian law dealing with the judicial review of decisions rejecting an asylum application, a personal hearing of the applicants is optional. Judicial decisions taken by court secretaries (a sub-judicial level) lacking judicial independence also seem to be in breach of the recast Asylum Procedures Directive and Article 47 of the Charter. By the end of 2017, the European Commission decided to move forward on the infringement procedures concerning Hungarian asylum law.¹⁰⁵

¹⁰⁴ European Commission, ‘Commission opens infringement procedure against Hungary concerning its asylum law’, IP/15/6228, 10 December 2015, available at: <https://goo.gl/9CNoUj>.

¹⁰⁵ European Commission, ‘Migration: Commission steps up infringement against Hungary concerning its asylum law’, IP/17/5023, 7 December 2017, available at: <http://bit.ly/2sJ4Vgu>.

3.4. Legal assistance

There is no longer a separate procedure for admissibility, therefore the same rules as in the [Regular Procedure: Legal Assistance](#) apply. What is particularly problematic for asylum seekers in the case of an inadmissibility decision are short deadlines (only 3 days to lodge an appeal) and the fact that hearing at the court is an exception rather than the rule. In such a short time it is hard to get access to legal assistance. The importance of legal assistance is on the other hand seriously restricted since the courts are only performing an *ex tunc* examination and do not want to take into account any new evidence presented during the judicial review procedure.

4. Border procedure (border and transit zones)

In 2017, the border procedure was used only until the amendments to the Asylum Act entered into force on 28 March 2017. The amendments prescribe that due to the current state of mass migration emergency the provisions on border procedures detailed below are no longer applicable.

4.1. General (scope, time limits)

Indicators: Border Procedure: General

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1. Do border authorities receive written instructions on the referral of asylum seekers to the competent authorities? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No |
| 2. Can an application made at the border be examined in substance during a border procedure? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No |
| ❖ Airport procedure | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No |
| ❖ Transit zones | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No |
| 3. Is there a maximum time limit for a first instance decision laid down in the law? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No |
| ❖ If yes, what is the maximum time limit? | Airport 8 days
Transit zones 28 days |

There are two types of border procedures: (a) the so called “airport procedure” and (b) the procedure in transit zones. Both procedures cannot be applied in case of persons with special needs.¹⁰⁶ However, given the general absence of a mechanism to properly identify vulnerability, the authorities only establish the existence of special needs for persons with clearly visible vulnerabilities, thereby leaving asylum seekers with trauma or mental health problems or victims of trafficking to be processed in the border procedure.

Airport procedure

The airport procedure is regulated in Section 72 of the Asylum Act and Section 93 of the Asylum Decree. The procedure is also handled by the IAO. Although there are approximately 100 to 200 asylum applications submitted at the airport each year, the airport procedure is rarely applied in practice.

Asylum seekers may not be held in the holding facility at the Budapest international airport transit zone for more than 8 calendar days. If the application is not deemed inadmissible or manifestly unfounded or no decision has been taken after 8 days, the asylum seeker has to be allowed entry into the country and a regular procedure will be carried out.¹⁰⁷ However, asylum seekers admitted to the country are usually detained, since applying for asylum in the airport procedure constitutes a ground for asylum detention.¹⁰⁸

Procedure in the transit zones

The border procedure in transit zones was introduced in September 2015 and is regulated in Article 71/A of the Asylum Act. The transit zones were established at Serbian and Croatian borders. The transit

¹⁰⁶ Sections 71A(7) and 72(6) Asylum Act.

¹⁰⁷ Section 72(5) Asylum Act.

¹⁰⁸ Section 31/A(e) Asylum Act.

zone is where immigration and asylum procedures are conducted and where buildings required for conducting such procedures and housing migrants and asylum seekers are located. Asylum seekers could be held there for a maximum period of 4 weeks.

According to the Asylum Act, border procedure cannot be applied to vulnerable asylum seekers.¹⁰⁹ Since there is no identification mechanism in place, the only vulnerabilities that are taken into account are the visible ones. This means that usually only families, unaccompanied minors, single women, elderly and disabled would be excluded from the border procedure and after admittance to the transit zone, they would be transferred to the open or closed camps in the country.¹¹⁰

The border procedure is a specific type of admissibility procedure; therefore the assessment of the claim is limited to a limited set of circumstances, in most cases to the sole fact whether the applicant entered Hungary from a safe third country. The applicant's actual need of international protection is not assessed at all in the border procedure.

The IAO has to deliver a decision within a maximum of 8 calendar days. In the cases directly witnessed by the HHC, the IAO actually delivers an inadmissibility decision at the transit zone in less than an hour. This is confirmed by UNHCR.¹¹¹ Such speedy decision-making gives rise to evident concerns regarding the quality and the individualisation of asylum proceedings as required by EU law¹¹² and the application of even the most basic due process safeguards.

In parallel with the inadmissibility decision, the IAO also immediately expels the rejected asylum seeker and orders a ban on entry and stay for 1 or 2 years. This ban is entered into the Schengen Information System and prevents the person from entering the entire Schengen area in any lawful way.

The law provides that the asylum seeker,

“[A]fter being informed [about the application of the safe third country notion in her/his case can, without delay and in any case not later than within 3 days, make a declaration concerning why in her/his individual case the given country cannot be considered as safe.”¹¹³

In principle, this provision could function as a safeguard, if – with the help of professional legal advisors – asylum seekers had sufficient time to collect and present arguments to challenge the IAO's decision. In practice, however, asylum seekers are deprived of the opportunity to challenge the application of the safe third country concept on the merits. In all cases witnessed by the HHC after 15 September 2015, except for a few families, asylum seekers were quickly informed about the application of the safe third country notion. Immediately after this, the IAO offered them the possibility to challenge this preliminary conclusion by signing a simple statement according to which they disagree. Then the IAO immediately took a decision without considering the applicant's statement. Asylum seekers thus had neither the opportunity to consult a legal advisor, nor to collect any supporting in-merit argument. This procedure therefore reduces the possibility to challenge the safe third country argument in the administrative procedure to a purely formal and ineffective safeguard, which can have no impact whatsoever on the decision. This constitutes a violation of the right to be heard embedded in the EU Charter of Fundamental Rights,¹¹⁴ as interpreted by the Court of Justice of the European Union (CJEU).¹¹⁵

In 2016 the Szeged Court quashed some of these inadmissibility decisions precisely because the 3-day deadline for submitting additional evidence was not respected. However, the HHC still observes that in some cases, the IAO simply asks the asylum seeker after the interview if he or she has something to

¹⁰⁹ Section 71A(7) Asylum Act.

¹¹⁰ Section 71A(4) Asylum Act.

¹¹¹ UNHCR, *Hungary as a country of asylum*, May 2016, para 25.

¹¹² Article 10(3)(a) recast Asylum Procedures Directive; Article 4(3)(c) recast Qualification Directive.

¹¹³ Section 51(11) Asylum Act.

¹¹⁴ Article 41(2) EU Charter.

¹¹⁵ Cf. CJEU, Case C-277/11 *M.M. v. Minister for Justice, Equality and Law Reform, Ireland, Attorney General*, Judgment of 22 November 2012.

add in the following 3 days and if the asylum seeker answers “no”, then the IAO does not wait for the 3 days to pass, but immediately issues an inadmissibility decision. The HHC’s lawyers also observed that in **Röske** transit zone the IAO case officers only accept the submissions of the asylum seekers on the safety of Serbia in their individual case in written English. When asylum seekers wanted to submit something in their mother tongues, the case officers sent them away saying that they should ask their friends to translate these into English.

Furthermore, the IAO interprets the law in the sense that the 3-day deadline starts on the day of the interview, and not the next day. This is clearly a violation of procedural rules. For example, an asylum seeker was let in the transit zone on 22 December 2016. He was told that he had 3 days to submit evidence as to why Serbia is not safe in his case. The 3-day deadline should have been over on 25 December, but since this is a public holiday (and so is 26 December), the deadline should have been over on 27 December. He wanted to make his submission on the 27, but the IAO had already issued an inadmissibility decision, arguing that he did not submit anything on time and saying that in his case the 3-day deadline was over on 24 December.

The European Committee for the Prevention of Torture (CPT) observed the following with regard to the border procedure:

“The CPT notes the combination of the expediency of border asylum procedures, the lack of automatic suspensive effect of appeals against administrative decisions rejecting asylum applications as inadmissible, the absence of an obligation to hear the person by the court in the appellate proceedings, the possibility to take final court decisions by a judicial clerk, the impossibility to present new facts and evidence before the court and problematic access to legal assistance. Consequently, the CPT has serious doubts whether border asylum procedures are in practice accompanied by appropriate safeguards, whether they provide a real opportunity for foreign nationals to present their case and involve an individual assessment of the risk of ill-treatment in case of removal and thus provide an effective protection against refoulement, bearing also in mind that, according to UNHCR, Serbia cannot be considered a safe country of asylum due to the shortcomings in its asylum system, notably its inability to cope with the increasing numbers of asylum applications.”¹¹⁶

4.2. Personal interview

The same rules as in the [Regular Procedure: Personal Interview](#) apply.

Asylum seekers usually arrive at the border following a painful journey of several weeks or months. They are exhausted, many of them traumatised. Until November 2016, when the IAO working time changed, the interviews happened in very late evening hours. The HHC is aware of cases where the interview lasted only 10 minutes, which included the reading back of the interview minutes. During such short interviews, asylum seekers do not have an effective opportunity to explain their asylum motives nor is there appropriate information given to them on the concept of Serbia being a safe third country.

In the border procedure, asylum seekers also have complained about the quality of remote interpretation, as interpretation is carried out through the internet or telephone.

¹¹⁶ CPT, *Report to the Hungarian Government on the visit to Hungary carried out from 21 to 27 October 2015*, 3 November 2016, available at: <https://goo.gl/uJ22x7>, para 69.

4.3. Appeal

Indicators: Border Procedure: Appeal

☒ Same as admissibility procedure

1. Does the law provide for an appeal against the decision in the border procedure?

- | | | |
|------------------------------|--|---|
| ❖ If yes, is it | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No |
| ❖ If yes, is it suspensive | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Judicial | <input type="checkbox"/> Administrative |
| ○ Safe third country grounds | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No |
| ○ Other grounds | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No |

Regarding the appeal in border procedure, the same rules apply as in case of appeal against inadmissible decisions or decisions in the accelerated procedure.

Asylum seekers who submit the appeal are obliged to wait for the outcome of the judicial review process in the transit zone.

According to the HHC, the border procedure does not offer an effective remedy against negative first-instance decisions. As rejections are passed in less than an hour, asylum seekers have no time to have a rest and get prepared for the interview, and even less for preparing a proper appeal. The asylum seekers the HHC interviewed after rejection did not understand the reasons for the rejection (not easily understandable consequence given the complexity of the legal question at stake – the safe third country concept – for anyone without specific training in refugee law), and their right to turn to court. In such a context, the 7-day time limit to submit a judicial review request is excessively short. The excessively short deadline makes it difficult for the asylum seeker to exercise her/his right to an effective remedy and thus it questions the rule's compliance with EU law.¹¹⁷

Asylum seekers who did not use the opportunity to appeal immediately after rejection still have 7 days under the law for submitting the request for judicial review to the IAO.¹¹⁸ At the same time, they are immediately “pushed back” from the transit zone in the direction of Serbia – yet to what is still Hungarian territory. It is highly questionable whether these rejected asylum seekers can have any access to the legal remedy they are entitled to, as they cannot even physically contact the asylum authority, being on the other side of the fence.

On 15 September 2015, the HHC monitors assisted a number of asylum seekers in submitting their appeal. When requesting information about the practical modalities for this, an IAO officer informed the HHC that the asylum seekers in question can submit their appeal but they should “stand in the queue again” and wait for being admitted to the transit zone, like any other asylum seeker. In light of the extremely limited access to the transit zone (see section on [Access to the Territory](#)) this may easily be equal to the deprivation of the right to appeal and thus a violation of EU law.¹¹⁹

In 2016 the above practice has changed, and the IAO now waits for the 7-day deadline to pass and only afterwards sends the person who does not appeal out of the transit zone to the Serbian side. In 2016, asylum seekers would usually appeal the inadmissibility decision, which would in most cases mean that their procedure would not terminate within 28 days and they would be let into the camps in the country. Despite this, there were some cases, where the procedure ended within 4 weeks and asylum seekers were forced to leave the transit zone in the direction of Serbia. The HHC has brought 4 such cases to the ECtHR, one of which led to the *Ilias and Ahmed v. Hungary* judgment.

The HHC lawyers have also reported that the IAO does not always send the lawyers' submissions to the court, even though they are submitted within 1-2 days from the issuance of the inadmissibility decision. The court is therefore not aware that the applicant has a lawyer representing him or her. This happens

¹¹⁷ Article 46(4) recast Asylum Procedures Directive.

¹¹⁸ Section 53(3) Asylum Act.

¹¹⁹ Article 46(1) recast Asylum Procedures Directive; Article 47 EU Charter.

even though the HHC lawyers also bring their submissions physically to the court, but since the court usually decides within 1-2 days from the day they get the case file from the IAO, the files brought to the court often also do not reach the decision-maker in time.

The personal hearing is not mandatory. Eventual hearings are to be held in the transit zone, and remote audio and video connection can also be used, for example for interpretation.¹²⁰ This is particularly problematic, since the IAO interviews are also usually very short as mentioned in [Border Procedure: Personal Interview](#).

The same problems regarding ineffectiveness of this legal remedy apply as for the appeals against inadmissible decisions (see [Admissibility Procedure: Appeal](#)).

UNHCR is concerned that during the judicial review the court is limited to an *ex tunc* rather than an *ex nunc* examination of both facts and law, i.e. the facts and law as applicable at the time of the original decision, and not that of the review. This may be at variance with the right to an effective remedy under the recast Asylum Procedures Directive and the ECHR. Further, while the court has the discretion to conduct a hearing if necessary, and applicants may request an oral hearing, in UNHCR's view, in practice applicants have access to limited legal aid and thus are not informed of their right to do so. This may give rise to interference with standards of due process and procedural fairness and the right to an effective remedy.¹²¹

4.4. Legal assistance

Indicators: Border Procedure: Legal Assistance

☒ Same as regular procedure

1. Do asylum seekers have access to free legal assistance at first instance in practice?

<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> With difficulty	<input type="checkbox"/> No
------------------------------	---	-----------------------------

 - ❖ Does free legal assistance cover:

<input type="checkbox"/> Representation in interview
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Legal advice

2. Do asylum seekers have access to free legal assistance on appeal against a negative decision in practice?

<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> With difficulty	<input type="checkbox"/> No
------------------------------	---	-----------------------------

 - ❖ Does free legal assistance cover

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Representation in courts
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Legal advice

The rules and practice described in [Regular Procedure: Legal Assistance](#) apply.

5. Accelerated procedure

The Asylum Act lays down an accelerated procedure, where the IAO is expected to pass a decision within the short timeframe of 15 days.¹²²

The law provides 10 different grounds for referring an admissible asylum claim into an accelerated procedure,¹²³ where the applicant:

- (a) Discloses only information irrelevant for recognition as both a refugee and a beneficiary of subsidiary protection;
- (b) Originates from a country listed on the European Union or national list of safe countries of origin as specified by separate legislation;
- (c) Misled the authorities by providing false information on his or her identity or nationality
 - by providing false information;
 - by submitting false documents; or

¹²⁰ Section 71/A(10) Asylum Act.

¹²¹ UNHCR, *Hungary as a country of asylum*, May 2016, para 18.

¹²² Section 47(2) Asylum Act.

¹²³ Section 51(7) Asylum Act.

- by withholding information or documents that would have been able to influence the decision-making adversely;
- (d) Has destroyed or thrown away, presumably in bad faith, his or her identity card or travel document that would have been helpful in establishing his or her identity of nationality;
- (e) Makes clearly incoherent, contradictory, clearly false or obviously unlikely statements contradicting the duly substantiated information related to the country of origin that makes it clear that, on the basis of his or her application, he or she is not entitled to recognition as a refugee or beneficiary of subsidiary protection;
- (f) Submitted a subsequent application that is not inadmissible;
- (g) Submitted an application for the only reason of delaying or frustrating the order of the alien policing expulsion or carrying out of the expulsion ordered by the refugee authority, the alien police authority or the court;
- (h) Entered into the territory of Hungary unlawfully or extended his or her period of residence unlawfully and failed to submit an application for recognition within a reasonable time although he or she would have been able to submit it earlier and has no reasonable excuse for the delay;
- (i) Refuses to comply with an obligation to have his/her fingerprints taken; or
- (j) For a serious reason may pose a threat to Hungary's national security or public order, or he or she was expelled by the alien policing authority due to harming or threatening public safety or the public order.

The application cannot be rejected solely on the grounds of failing to submit an application within a reasonable time.¹²⁴

In accelerated proceedings, the IAO, with the exception of the case when the applicant originates from a safe country of origin, shall assess the merits of the application for recognition in order to establish whether the criteria for recognition as a refugee or beneficiary of subsidiary protection exist.¹²⁵

In the event of applying accelerated procedure to an applicant originating from safe country of origin, the applicant, when this fact is communicated to him or her, can declare immediately but within 3 days at the latest why in his or her individual case, the specific country does not qualify as a safe country of origin.¹²⁶ Where the safe country of origin fails to take over the applicant, the refugee authority shall withdraw its decision and continue the procedure.¹²⁷

The HHC is of the opinion that there is a high risk that the use of accelerated procedures is not going to be limited to obviously unfounded or in some way "abusive" asylum claims, but may even be used as the general rule and not as an exception.¹²⁸ The HHC has noticed some cases in asylum detention, where applicants from Afghanistan would receive a negative decision in accelerated procedure, rejecting their claim as manifestly unfounded on the ground that the internal protection alternative is applicable in their case, while mentioning that they would otherwise qualify for subsidiary protection. According to the HHC, examining the internal protection alternative in accelerated procedure is not appropriate.

Besides, despite the possibility to request for the suspension of the execution of the expulsion, the IAO starts the execution of the expulsion procedure before the 7 days available for submitting an appeal against the negative decision in accelerated procedures or inadmissible cases. As a result, asylum seekers are immediately brought to immigration detention, which was also the case in the above mentioned examples. The IAO claims that if a person requests for suspension of the execution of the expulsion, they would not start to execute expulsion until a decision on the suspensive effect is taken by the court. However, in practice, asylum seekers are not informed about the possibility to request the suspension of the expulsion and, even when informed, they do not understand the significance of this

¹²⁴ Section 51(8) Asylum Act.

¹²⁵ Section 51(9) Asylum Act.

¹²⁶ Section 51(11) Asylum Act.

¹²⁷ Section 51A Asylum Act.

¹²⁸ HHC, *Building a legal fence – Changes to Hungarian asylum law jeopardise access to protection in Hungary*, Information Note, 7 August 2015, available at: <http://bit.ly/1KZYGEg>.

information. In all cases where suspensive effect is not automatic, it is difficult to imagine how an asylum seeker will be able to submit a request for the suspension of his or her removal as he or she is typically without professional legal assistance and subject to an unreasonably short deadline to lodge the request. Further exacerbating asylum seekers' position, the rules allowing for a request to grant suspensive effect to be submitted are not found in the Asylum Act itself, but they emanate from general rules concerning civil court procedures.

The HHC's attorneys have also observed an increasing use of accelerated procedures in the asylum detention centre of **Kiskunhalas** (which is now closed) since December 2016, due to the fact that the IAO can no longer suspend the asylum procedure in case of a Eurodac hit from Greece (see [Dublin: Suspension of Transfers](#)). The accelerated procedure is mainly used for Moroccans and Algerians, but also Arab Iraqis, which is clearly abusive since they usually state relevant facts of persecution and/or serious harm and their cases should not be assessed as manifestly unfounded. In 2017, the accelerated procedure was hardly ever used.

15 days for processing a first-time asylum application is – as a general rule – insufficient time period for ensuring the indispensable requirements of such a procedure, including finding the right interpreter, conducting a proper asylum interview, obtaining individualised and high-quality country information, obtaining – if necessary – medical or other specific evidence, and an eventual follow-up interview allowing the asylum seeker to react on adverse credibility findings or legal conclusions.¹²⁹ This extremely short deadline is therefore in breach of EU law, which requires reasonable time limits for accelerated procedures, “without prejudice to an adequate and complete examination being carried out” and to the applicant’s effective access to basic guarantees provided for in EU asylum legislation.¹³⁰

Also in contradiction to the relevant EU rule, Hungarian law does not set forth any specific safeguard that would prevent the undue application of accelerated procedures to asylum seekers in need of special procedural guarantees.¹³¹

The rules governing the appeal in accelerated procedure are the same as in case of inadmissible decisions (see section on [Admissibility Procedure](#)).

According to the statistics of IAO, 171 applications for asylum were examined in an accelerated procedure in 2017.¹³²

D. Guarantees for vulnerable groups

1. Identification

Indicators: Identification

1. Is there a specific identification mechanism in place to systematically identify vulnerable asylum seekers? ☐ Yes ☐ For certain categories ☒ No
❖ If for certain categories, specify which:
2. Does the law provide for an identification mechanism for unaccompanied children? ☐ Yes ☒ No

Under the Asylum Act, a person with special needs can be an “unaccompanied minor or a vulnerable person, in particular, a minor, elderly or disabled person, pregnant woman, single parent raising a minor child and a person who has suffered from torture, rape or any other grave form of psychological, physical or sexual violence, found, after proper individual evaluation, to have special needs because of

¹²⁹ The latter being mandatory under EU law as interpreted by the CJEU. See Case C-277/11 *M.M. v. Minister for Justice, Equality and Law Reform, Ireland, Attorney General*, Judgment of 22 November 2012 and Case C-349/07 *Sopropé – Organizações de Calçado Lda v Fazenda Pública*, Judgment of 18 December 2008.

¹³⁰ Recital 20, Article 31(2) and (9) recast Asylum Procedures Directive.

¹³¹ Recital 30 recast Asylum Procedures Directive.

¹³² Information provided by IAO, 12 February 2018.

his/her individual situation".¹³³ Hungarian law does not explicitly include victims of human trafficking, persons suffering of serious illnesses and persons with mental disorders in the definition of vulnerable asylum seekers.

1.1. Screening of vulnerability

Although both the Asylum Act and the Asylum Decree provide that the special needs of certain asylum seekers should be addressed,¹³⁴ there is no further detailed guidance available in the law and no practical identification mechanism in place to adequately identify such persons. The Decree only foresees the obligation of the authority to consider whether the special rules for vulnerable asylum seekers are applicable in the given individual case. However, no procedural framework has been elaborated to implement this provision in practice.¹³⁵ Hungarian law also fails to provide a timeframe within which the asylum authority shall carry out this assessment, nor does it clarify in which phase of the proceedings this shall take place.

According to HHC, it generally depends on the asylum officer in charge whether the applicant's vulnerability will be examined and taken into account. An automatic screening and identification mechanism is lacking; applicants need to state that they require special treatment, upon which asylum officers consider having recourse to an expert opinion to confirm vulnerability. The IAO asks the asylum seeker in every asylum interview whether he or she has any health problems. This of course does not guarantee that the authorities get information about the special needs of asylum seekers.

A medical or psychological expert may be involved to determine the need for special treatment. The applicant should be informed in simple and understandable language about the examination and its consequences. The applicant has to consent to the examination, however, if no consent is given, the provisions applicable to persons with special needs will not apply to the case.¹³⁶ According to the HHC's lawyers it is up to the legal representative to argue that the applicant is vulnerable, which may be then considered by the case worker or it may still be disregarded. In the latter case the lack of proper assessment of the facts of the case (such as individual vulnerability) may lead to the annulment of the decision in the judicial review phase.

1.2. Age assessment of unaccompanied children

The law does not provide for an identification mechanism for unaccompanied children. The Asylum Act only foresees that an age assessment can be carried out in case there are doubts as to the alleged age of the applicant.¹³⁷ In case of such uncertainty, the asylum officer, without an obligation to inform the applicant of the reasons, may order an age assessment to be conducted. Therefore decisions concerning the need for an age assessment may be considered arbitrary.

The applicant (or his or her statutory representative or guardian) has to consent to the age assessment examination. The asylum application cannot be refused on the ground that the person did not consent to the age assessment.¹³⁸ However, as a consequence most of the provisions relating to children may not be applied in the case.¹³⁹

The age assessment is conducted by the military doctor in the transit zone. The main method employed is the mere observation of the child's physical appearance, e.g. weight, height etc., and the child's sexual maturity. In the context of age assessment, the IAO does *not* use a psycho-social assessment.

¹³³ Section 2(k) Asylum Act.

¹³⁴ Section 4(3) Asylum Act.

¹³⁵ Section 3(1) Asylum Decree.

¹³⁶ Section 3 Asylum Decree.

¹³⁷ Section 44(1) Asylum Act.

¹³⁸ Section 44(2) Asylum Act.

¹³⁹ Section 44(3) Asylum Act.

Since the entry into force of the new legal regime in March 2017, age assessment practices became even more important since the law differentiates between unaccompanied children below and above the age of 14. The consequences are severe: erroneous assessment of the applicant's age may result on his or her confinement in the transit zone which the HHC considers unlawful detention. The military doctor does not possess any specific professional knowledge that would make him appropriate to assess the age of asylum seekers, let alone differentiate between a 14 and a 15 year old. As is explained at length in the third party intervention of the AIRE Centre, Dutch Council for Refugees and ECRE in the *Darboe and Camara v. Italy* case,¹⁴⁰ there is currently a broad consensus among medics that existing age assessment methods alone cannot narrow down the age of the applicant to an adequate range to be relied on in the asylum procedure. The margin of error is the broadest among those around 15 years of age. It can therefore be easily seen that carrying out an age assessment procedure with the aim to clearly identify whether a child is under or above the age of 14 is highly problematic.

The previous updates of this report went to great lengths to explain why the methods used by the IAO are inadequate. Since the entry into force of the new law in March 2017, age assessment must be carried out in the transit zones which are not physically equipped for such purposes. The standards have therefore fallen even lower since the last report was published. Based on interviews with unaccompanied minors, the HHC lawyers found that in reality the "age assessment" takes mere minutes, during which the military doctor simply measures the applicants' height, looks at their teeth, measures the size of their hips and examines the shape of their body (whether it "resembles that of a child or more like that of an adolescent") alongside with signs of their sexual maturity (e.g. pubic hair, size of breasts). The HHC is of the opinion that this practice is highly unprofessional and is in breach of the fundamental rights of children.¹⁴¹

Up to the time of writing, no protocol has been adopted to provide for uniform standards on age assessment examinations carried out by the police and the IAO. On several occasions (conferences, roundtables etc.) the IAO denied its responsibility to adopt such a protocol, stating that age assessment is a medical question, which is beyond its professional scope or competence. The police elaborated a non-binding protocol for the purpose of police-ordered age assessment examinations that provide a checklist to be followed by doctors who are commissioned to carry out the examination.¹⁴² This protocol, which was published in 2014, would *not* take into account the psycho-social or intercultural elements of age assessment either. The protocol only foresees that in case the applicant (the subject of the age assessment) is suspected to be a victim of sexual violence, follow-up assistance from a psychologist may be requested (but this is not automatic and the HHC has never assisted a case where the authorities would refer the applicant to a psychologist *ex officio*).

The age assessment opinion usually does not specify the person's exact age; instead, it gives an estimate if the person is above or under 18 or margin of error of at least 2 years e.g. 17-19 or 16-18 years of age. In these cases, the benefit of the doubt is usually given to the applicant.

There is no direct remedy to challenge the age assessment opinion. It can only be challenged through the appeal against a negative decision in asylum procedure, which cannot be considered effective as in practice several months pass by the time the rejected application reaches the judicial phase of the procedure.

According to the IAO, 38 age assessment procedures were conducted by the military doctor in the transit zones in 2017. The IAO does not have statistics about the results of these age assessment procedures.¹⁴³

¹⁴⁰ AIRE Centre et al., *Third party intervention in Darboe and Camara v. Italy*, Application No. 5797/17, 5 July 2017, available at: <http://bit.ly/2gZ0Zmq>.

¹⁴¹ See also Council of Europe Lanzarote Committee, *Special report further to a visit to transit zones at the Serbian/Hungarian border*, T-ES(2017)11, 30 January 2018, available at <http://bit.ly/2C6bYyZ>.

¹⁴² The protocol is available in Hungarian at: <http://bit.ly/1X53QT6>.

¹⁴³ Information provided by IAO, 12 February 2018.

2. Special procedural guarantees

Indicators: Special Procedural Guarantees

1. Are there special procedural arrangements/guarantees for vulnerable people?

☒ Yes

☐ For certain categories

☐ No

❖ If for certain categories, specify which:

There is a specialised unit within the IAO which deals with asylum applications of vulnerable groups, namely the applications of unaccompanied children. The competent department is the Regional Directorate of Budapest and Pest County Asylum Unit. The employees (case officers) of the unit have special knowledge on unaccompanied minors which enables them to conduct the hearings and make the decision in accordance with their special situation.

According to the response of the IAO, training to this unit is provided every 6 months by asylum officials working at the Litigation Unit of the Refugee Directorate of the IAO. The training touches upon vulnerability aspects as well. The training is based on the EASO training modules and contains two levels: asylum case officers have to pass an online exam, and later there is a training with a trainer where the tasks of the online exam are also spoken about.

Based on the experience of HHC lawyers, it is mostly their individual sense of empathy, rather than professional support and training, that case officers make use of when interviewing unaccompanied children. Personal discussions with case officers shed light to the fact that being assigned to the cases of unaccompanied minors mostly happens without providing trainings on the specific legal provisions applicable in the cases of children or child friendly techniques to be used.

Around 18 case officers of the IAO were trained in November 2016 by the Cordelia Foundation and the HHC on torture victims and traumatised asylum seekers. There were complete asylum departments from the IAO from which no case officer came to this training e.g. **Békéscsaba** Asylum Department. The social workers working in open reception centres have not been trained in the past years, but some of them use the “Protect” questionnaire as a tool to identify torture victims.

2.1. Adequate support during the interview

The IAO is obliged to conduct an individual examination of the asylum claim by examining “[t]he social standing, personal circumstances, gender and age of the person [...] to establish whether the acts which have been or could be committed against the person applying for recognition qualify as persecution or serious harm.”¹⁴⁴ Persons making gender-based applications have the right to have their case considered by an asylum officer of the same sex if they so request,¹⁴⁵ and this right is respected in practice. Since 2018, the law also explicitly provides this for persons with claims based on gender identity.¹⁴⁶

There is a possibility to use sign language interpretation besides regular interpretation, as the costs of both are covered by the IAO.¹⁴⁷ If the asylum seeker is not able to write, this fact and his or her statement shall be included in the minutes.¹⁴⁸

In case the applicant cannot be interviewed due to being unfit to be heard, the IAO may decide not to carry out a personal interview. If in doubt about the asylum seeker’s fitness, the asylum authority will seek the opinion of a doctor or psychologist. If the doctor confirms this, the asylum applicant can be given an opportunity to make a written statement or the applicant’s family members can be interviewed.¹⁴⁹

¹⁴⁴ Section 90 Asylum Decree.

¹⁴⁵ Section 66(3) Asylum Decree.

¹⁴⁶ Section 66(3a) Asylum Decree.

¹⁴⁷ Section 36(7) Asylum Act.

¹⁴⁸ Section 62(2) Asylum Decree.

¹⁴⁹ Section 43(2) Asylum Act and Sections 77(1) and (2) Asylum Decree.

If the IAO has already obtained information about the fact that the asylum seeker is a victim of torture or trauma, the asylum seeker is interviewed by a specifically trained case officer. However, since there is no formal mechanism for identifying these asylum seekers, there is a risk that such an applicant is heard by a case officer who is not appropriately trained. If the applicant does not feel fit to be interviewed, the interview can be postponed, although the IAO can reject a request for postponement, if the postponement would prevent the IAO from taking its decision within the procedural deadline foreseen in the law. The IAO can also give permission for a family member or a psychologist to be present at the hearing, which has happened in the past. On one occasion in 2017, in the case of two highly vulnerable unaccompanied minors, the IAO denied access to a social worker to the asylum interview of the children, although the HHC lawyer had informed the IAO about the high level of trust they had come to place on her.

However, it has also happened that unaccompanied minors, victims of torture or traumatised asylum seekers were not interviewed in a proper room with suitable conditions for such hearings. Due to the lack of space, and due to the organisational shortcomings on the side of IAO, the interviews often take place in a room where there are other case officers. Some of the rooms at the Budapest Regional Directorate's Asylum Unit are separated by walls into two parts, but the walls are not high enough. This means that an interview of a victim of torture or traumatised asylum seeker can be interrupted by another applicant's interview, or that the information in the interview is not provided under conditions of confidentiality. Due to this, it may also happen – as it did in the case of an unaccompanied minor and victim of sexual abuse – that other case officers came and went to use the other room while the interview was taking place.

There was one occasion in April 2017 when upon request by the legal representative, the IAO conducted the interview in the Fót Children's Home of two highly vulnerable unaccompanied minor brothers who had been victims of sexual abuse. The IAO, in cooperation with the Children's Home guaranteed that the necessary technological equipment would be available in a private room facing a calm park where the children would feel safe and could therefore open up about their experiences. This was, according to the HHC, a great example of child-friendly administration. However this was a single event and it remains unclear whether the IAO would be willing to conduct interviews in the Children's Home for highly vulnerable unaccompanied minors.

In the experience of the HHC, unaccompanied minors above the age of 14 who need to wait for the end of their asylum procedure in the transit zone are systematically discontent with their asylum interviews. It is nearly impossible to carry out a child friendly interview in a metal container which is surrounded by a high barbed wire fence and hundreds of policemen. The minors often only see their case officer on the screen, since these hearings are seldom conducted in person but rather by using a special communications application designed for this purpose. The presence of policemen outside the doors of the container in which the interview takes place further diminishes the minors' trust in the case officer or the procedure as a whole.

Amendments that entered into force on 1 January 2018 describe detailed procedural safeguards for interviewing children. These include the requirement for the IAO to conduct the asylum interview in an understandable manner and by taking into account the age, maturity, the cultural and gender particularities of the child. This includes a child-friendly interview room for children below the age of 14. Any subsequent interview needs to be conducted by the same case officer in case the child needs to be heard. Finally, case officers interviewing children must possess the necessary knowledge on interviewing children.¹⁵⁰

2.2. Exemption from special procedures

There is no exemption of vulnerable groups from accelerated procedures.

¹⁵⁰ Section 74 Asylum Decree.

Prior to March 2017, the airport procedure and procedure in the transit zones could not be applied in case of vulnerable asylum seekers.¹⁵¹ In practice only asylum seekers with physically visible special needs (pregnant women, families) were exempted from the border procedure.¹⁵² Since March 2017 border procedures are no longer applied, since the procedure in the transit zones became a regular procedure and all asylum seekers have to remain in the transit zone until the end of the procedure. The only exception are unaccompanied children below the age of 14.

For unaccompanied children, the asylum authorities as a general rule have to trace the person responsible for the minor, except if it is presumed that there is a conflict or if the tracing is not justified in light of the minor's best interest.¹⁵³ The asylum authority may ask assistance in the family tracing from other member states, third countries, UNHCR, the International Committee of the Red Cross, the International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies and other international organisations engaged in supporting refugees. Practice shows, however, that this tracing is not carried out in practice by the IAO.

2.3. Appointment of guardian

In certain cases of vulnerable asylum seekers who lack full legal capacity (primarily children or due to mental health reasons), the IAO has to either involve their statutory representative or appoint a guardian. In case of children, the guardian should be appointed without delay in 8 days.¹⁵⁴

Since March 2017, unaccompanied children above the age of 14 need to await the end of their asylum procedure in the transit zone. Under the current legal regime, while in the asylum procedure, they are exempted from the special provision of child protection rules.¹⁵⁵ It means that they are not assigned a child protection guardian to be their permanent legal guardian but a temporary guardian ('case guardian' or 'ad-hoc guardian'). The children report that they do not talk to those temporary guardians at all, they only meet them during the interview conducted by the IAO.

3. Use of medical reports

Indicators: Use of Medical Reports

1. Does the law provide for the possibility of a medical report in support of the applicant's statements regarding past persecution or serious harm?
☒ Yes ☐ In some cases ☐ No
2. Are medical reports taken into account when assessing the credibility of the applicant's statements?
☐ Yes ☐ No

A medical expert opinion could be required to determine whether the asylum seeker has specific needs but there are no procedural rules on the use of such medical reports.¹⁵⁶ However, no criteria are set out in law or established by administrative practice indicating when a medical examination for the purpose of drafting a medical report should be carried out.

In case the asylum seeker's statements are incoherent and contradictory, it is possible to prove with the aid of a medical expert report that this is due to the applicant's health or psychological condition or due to previous trauma. Therefore the credibility of the asylum seeker should not be doubted based on his or her statements.¹⁵⁷

The HHC's experience shows that medical reports were frequently used in practice but mostly at the request of the applicant. The IAO has the possibility to order a medical examination *ex officio* in case

¹⁵¹ Sections 71/A(7) and 72(6) Asylum Act.

¹⁵² ECRE, *Crossing Boundaries*, October 2015, 17.

¹⁵³ Section 4 Asylum Decree.

¹⁵⁴ Section 80/J(6) Asylum Act.

¹⁵⁵ Section 4(1)(c) Law XXXI of 1997 on the Protection of Children.

¹⁵⁶ Section 3(2) Asylum Decree.

¹⁵⁷ Section 59 Asylum Act.

the applicant consents to it. However, this was rarely the case. It was usually the legal representative who obtained and submitted the medical opinion in order to substantiate the applicant's well-founded fear of persecution. In case the applicant obtained a private medical opinion, he or she has to cover the costs; the IAO covers the costs only for medical opinions it requests itself. The only NGO that deals with psycho-social rehabilitation of torture victims is the Cordelia Foundation, which prepares medical reports on applicants' conditions in line with the requirements set out in the Istanbul Protocol. The psychiatrists of this NGO, however, are not forensic experts and in some cases their opinion was not recognised by the IAO or courts, since according to the Act CXL of 2004 on the General Rules of Public Administration Procedures, the expert opinion may only be delivered by a forensic expert registered by the competent ministry.¹⁵⁸ For the reasons above (the lack of an official forensic expert standing in proceedings), sometimes both the IAO and the courts disregarded the medical opinion issued by the Cordelia Foundation.¹⁵⁹

Since all asylum seekers with the exception of unaccompanied children below the age of 14 – and those applied for asylum having lawful residence – are held in the transit zone, to which Cordelia Foundation has no access, medical reports are no longer used in the asylum procedures in the transit zones. Medical reports provided by the Cordelia Foundation remain to be used in asylum procedures of unaccompanied children below the age of 14 and in Dublin procedures, with the aim of providing proof of their special vulnerability to the receiving Member State such as in those cases who apply for asylum within the territory of Hungary thus have access to the services of Cordelia Foundation.

The HHC lawyers report that in the transit zones the IAO does not take the medical reports into account at all. Moreover, the legal representative has no access to them; neither the client gets a copy of them, but can ask for it. The medical reports are not stored together with the case files so many times the case officers do not even know about the medical problem if the asylum seeker did not mention it during the interview. Once the IAO did not know about the pregnancy of a woman who was already in her 6th month.

4. Legal representation of unaccompanied children

Indicators: Unaccompanied Children

1. Does the law provide for an identification mechanism for unaccompanied children?
☐ Yes ☒ No
2. Does the law provide for the appointment of a representative to all unaccompanied children?
☒ Yes ☐ No

The law provides for the appointment of a legal representative upon identification of an unaccompanied child. When realising that the asylum seeker is an unaccompanied minor, regardless of the phase of the asylum procedure, the IAO has to contact the Guardianship Authority which will appoint within 8 days a guardian to represent the unaccompanied child.¹⁶⁰ The appointed guardian is not only responsible for legal representation in the asylum procedure and other legal proceedings but also for the child's overall care property management.

In practice delays may sometimes be observed in the appointment of guardians. However, these delays have become less frequent and shorter than delays experienced in 2015 and 2016.

Under the current system, legal guardians are responsible for asylum seeking unaccompanied children under the age of 14 who are staying in the Károlyi István Children's Home in Fót and for unaccompanied children who had been granted international protection and were thus released from the transit zone and transferred to the Children's Home.

For unaccompanied children above the age of 14, *ad-hoc* guardians are appointed whose mandate is, by definition, a temporary one. They do not have to be trained to care for children the same way legal

¹⁵⁸ Section 58(3) Asylum Act.

¹⁵⁹ See Cordelia Foundation et al. *From Torture to Detention*, January 2016, available at: <http://bit.ly/1Xrmhoi>.

¹⁶⁰ Section 80/J(6) Asylum Act.

guardians need to be. They are also not trained in asylum law and can hardly speak English. Given the physical distance between the *ad-hoc* guardians' workplace (Szeged) and the transit zone, the children and their *ad-hoc* guardians mostly only meet twice: at the interview and when the decision is communicated. Based on personal interviews with unaccompanied children, the HHC lawyers found out that most of the time there is no direct communication between the *ad-hoc* guardians and the unaccompanied children they are responsible for.¹⁶¹

The legal guardians are employed by the Department of Child Protection Services (TEGYESZ). Though delays have become less of a problem in 2017, there still remain severe obstacles regarding the children's effective access to their legal guardians. Under the Child Protection Act, a guardian may be responsible for 30 children at the same time.¹⁶² Based on personal interviews with guardians, the HHC found that this is hardly the case, as some of them gave accounts of caring for 40-45 children at once. This means that in practice, guardians cannot always devote adequate time to all the children they represent. Not all guardians speak a sufficient level of English and even if they do, the children they are in charge of may not. TEGYESZ employs one interpreter but guardians do not always have access to his services.

Legal guardians have participated in trainings held by the HHC, the Cordelia Foundation and other actors such as IOM. The HHC is currently involved in two projects, funded by the EU, which aim at strengthening the guardians' knowledge of asylum law and child friendly administration. The HHC and other NGOs continue to enjoy a good working relationship with legal guardians.

Since December 2016, monthly roundtable discussions have been held at the initiation of the HHC and with the participation of the legal guardians, the Károlyi István Children's Home, SOS Children's Villages Hungary, the Menedék Association for Migrants, the Cordelia Foundation, UNHCR Hungary and IOM. The discussions aim to serve as a substitution for the non-existent best interest determination procedure by providing for a multidisciplinary case assessment in the case of those children staying in the Károlyi István Children's Home while also discussing broader, systematic issues such as the children's access to education. Currently this is the only forum where State actors and the NGO sector together discuss how to further the case of unaccompanied children.¹⁶³

The role of the child protection guardian consists of supervising the care for the child, following and monitoring his or her physical, mental and emotional development.¹⁶⁴ In order to fulfil his or her duties, the child protection guardian has a mandate to generally substitute the absent parents. He or she:

- Is obliged to keep regular personal contact with the child;
- Provides the child with his or her contact details so the child can reach him or her;
- If necessary, supervises and facilitates the relationship and contact with the parents;
- Participates in drafting the child care plan with other child protection officials around the child;
- Participates in various crime prevention measures if the child is a juvenile offender;
- Assists the child in choosing a life-path, schooling and profession;
- Represents the interests of the child in any official proceedings;
- Gives consent when required in medical interventions;
- Takes care of the schooling of the child (enrolment, contact with the school and teachers etc.);
- Handles / manages the properties of the child and reports on it to the guardianship services;
- Reports on his or her activities every 6 months.

Due to the above-mentioned shortcomings, the guardians normally find it extremely challenging to adequately fulfil their duties in a due manner and be regularly in touch with the children they are responsible for.

¹⁶¹ See also 'Special report further to a visit undertaken by a delegation of the Lanzarote Committee to transit zones at the Serbian/Hungarian border, 5-7 July 2017', available at <http://bit.ly/2C50qfw>.

¹⁶² Section 84(6) Law XXXI of 1997 on the Protection of Children.

¹⁶³ EuroChild and SOS Children's Villages International, *Let Children Be Children*, November 2017, available at: <http://bit.ly/2CALKVQ>, 75.

¹⁶⁴ Section 86 Child Protection Act.

The child care guardian cannot give his or her consent to the adoption of the child. Although adoption is not an option for unaccompanied minors, SOS Children's Villages Hungary managed a project in 2017 to recruit and train families who would be willing to become the foster family for children from a migrant background.¹⁶⁵ Based on personal discussions with SOS Children's Villages Hungary staff members, the HHC can report that a few families have completed the training and one child, who had been represented by the HHC in his asylum procedure, moved to a foster family in September. While being placed with a foster parent, the children's legal guardian remains the same as before – this role therefore is not given up or shifted to the foster families.

The child protection guardian may give consent to a trained legal representative to participate in the asylum procedure. Both the guardian and the legal representative are entitled to submit motions and evidence on behalf of the applicant and they may ask questions to the asylum seeker during the interview.

E. Subsequent applications

Indicators: Subsequent Applications

1. Does the law provide for a specific procedure for subsequent applications? ☒ Yes ☐ No
2. Is a removal order suspended during the examination of a first subsequent application?¹⁶⁶
 - ❖ At first instance ☒ Yes ☐ No
 - ❖ At the appeal stage Depending on outcome
3. Is a removal order suspended during the examination of a second, third, subsequent application?
 - ❖ At first instance ☒ Yes ☐ No
 - ❖ At the appeal stage Depending on outcome

A subsequent application is considered as an application following a final termination or rejection decision on the former application. New circumstances or facts have to be submitted in order for a subsequent application to be admissible.¹⁶⁷ For persons whose applications are considered to have been tacitly withdrawn (i.e. they left Hungary and moved on to another EU Member State) and the asylum procedure had been terminated, the asylum procedure may be continued if the person requests such a continuation within 9 months of the withdrawal of the original application. Where that time limit has expired, the person is considered to be a subsequent applicant.¹⁶⁸ Persons who withdraw their application in writing cannot request the continuation of their asylum procedure upon return to Hungary; therefore they will have to submit a subsequent application and present new facts or circumstances (see section [Dublin: Procedure](#)).

Submitting a subsequent application carries a series of consequences for the applicant:

- (a) New facts or circumstances have to be presented in order for the application to be admissible;¹⁶⁹
- (b) Admissible subsequent applications are examined in an accelerated procedure (see section on the [Accelerated Procedure](#));¹⁷⁰
- (c) The court hearing of subsequent applicants who are detained can be dispensed if their subsequent application is based on the same factual grounds as the previous one;¹⁷¹

¹⁶⁵ EuroChild and SOS Children's Villages International, *Let Children Be Children*, November 2017, 72.

¹⁶⁶ Most of the asylum seekers are held in the transit zones, which means that none of them has a right to remain on the territory of Hungary. They are waiting to be granted the right to enter the territory. But this does not mean that subsequent applicants would have to wait for their decision in Serbia, they are allowed to wait for them in the transit zones, but they are not entitled to any food or hygienic kits. So in practice we can speak of a suspension of removal, but not in the sense of having a right to remain on the territory, only in the transit zone.

¹⁶⁷ Section 51(2)(d) Asylum Act.

¹⁶⁸ Section 66(6) Asylum Act.

¹⁶⁹ Section 51(2)(d) Asylum Act.

¹⁷⁰ Section 51(7)(f) Asylum Act.

¹⁷¹ Section 68(4)(c) Asylum Act.

- (d) The IAO hearing can be dispensed if a person failed to state facts or to provide proofs that would allow the recognition as a refugee or beneficiary of subsidiary protection in the subsequent application;¹⁷²
- (e) The right to remain on the territory and reception conditions throughout the examination of application are not provided for the subsequent asylum application.¹⁷³ Since all asylum seekers except unaccompanied minors below age of 14 are kept in the transit zone (without the right to enter Hungary) for the whole duration of asylum procedure, the fact that the subsequent applicants do not have a right to remain on the territory does not actually mean that they are returned to Serbia before getting a decision in their asylum procedure. They are also allowed to stay in the transit zone. However, they do not receive any food or any other material conditions. They only get a bed in a living container. The HHC requested the ECtHR to issue an interim measure based on Rule 39 in case of a subsequent applicant who did not receive any food in the transit zone.¹⁷⁴ The interim measure was granted but the Hungarian authorities did not comply with it. The HHC requested another interim measure which was also granted and this time the Court explicitly requested the Hungarian Government to provide food to the applicant. The Hungarian Government did not abide by this request either.¹⁷⁵
- (f) Judicial review of rejected subsequent applications does not have a suspensive effect (see [Accelerated Procedure](#));¹⁷⁶
- (g) Amendments entering into force on 1 January 2018 provide that subsequent procedures are no longer free of charge. As a general rule, applicants in repeat procedures will be granted exemption from paying for any costs incurred during the procedure (e.g. related to expert opinions) but applicants having adequate financial resources may be required to pay such fees. This will be decided on a case-by-case basis by the IAO based on the personal circumstances of the applicants, and a standalone legal remedy will be available against the interim decision of the IAO.¹⁷⁷

There is no time limit on submitting a subsequent application or explicit limitation on the number of asylum applications that may be lodged.

Not much guidance is provided by the Asylum Act as to what can be considered as new elements. Section 86 of the Asylum Decree only stipulates that the refugee authority shall primarily assess whether the person seeking recognition was able to substantiate any new facts or circumstances as grounds for the recognition of the applicant as a refugee or as a beneficiary of subsidiary protection. The existence or not of new facts or circumstances is determined in the admissibility procedure.

Given the lack of clear and publicly available guidelines, the IAO may interpret the concept of “new facts or circumstances” in a restrictive and arbitrary way. It should be mentioned, however, that it is not a large-scale problem, as most asylum seekers with new evidence or information about their relatives or the country of origin are granted access to the in-merit procedure.

¹⁷² Section 43(2)(b) Asylum Act.

¹⁷³ Section 80/K(11) Asylum Act. This is due to the mass migration crisis measures.

¹⁷⁴ ECtHR, *R.R. v. Hungary*, Application No 36037/17.

¹⁷⁵ Politico, ‘Hungary ignoring court orders to improve border camp conditions: watchdog’, 29 July 2017, available at http://politi.co/2FZsPpR_.

¹⁷⁶ Section 53(2) Asylum Act.

¹⁷⁷ Section 34 Asylum Act.

F. The safe country concepts

Indicators: Safe Country Concepts

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1. Does national legislation allow for the use of “safe country of origin” concept? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No |
| ❖ Is there a national list of safe countries of origin? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No |
| ❖ Is the safe country of origin concept used in practice? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No |
| 2. Does national legislation allow for the use of “safe third country” concept? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No |
| ❖ Is the safe third country concept used in practice? | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No |
| 3. Does national legislation allow for the use of “first country of asylum” concept? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No |

1. First country of asylum

Under Section 51(2)(c) of the Asylum Act, the “first country of asylum” concerns cases where “the applicant was recognised by a third country as a refugee, provided that this protection exists at the time of the assessment of the application and the third country in question is prepared to admit the applicant”. The “first country of asylum” is a ground for inadmissibility. There is no further legislative guidance on this concept. The criteria listed in Article 38(1) of the recast Asylum Procedures Directive are not applied.

2. Safe third country

According to Section 2(i) of the Asylum Act, a safe third country is defined as:

“[A]ny country in connection to which the refugee authority has ascertained that the applicant is treated in line with the following principles:

- (a) his/her life and liberty are not jeopardised for racial or religious reasons or on account of his/her ethnicity/nationality, membership of a social group or political conviction and the applicant is not exposed to the risk of serious harm;
- (b) the principle of non-refoulement is observed in accordance with the Geneva Convention;
- (c) the rule of international law, according to which the applicant may not be expelled to the territory of a country where s/he would be exposed to death penalty, torture, cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment, is recognised and applied, and
- (d) the option to apply for recognition as a refugee is ensured, and in the event of recognition as a refugee, protection in conformance of the Geneva Convention is guaranteed.”

Section 51(2)(e) provides that an application is inadmissible “if there exists a country in connection with the applicant which qualifies as a safe third country for him or her.”

2.1. Connection criteria

The “safe third country” concept may only be applied as an inadmissibility ground where the applicant (a) stayed or (b) travelled there and had the opportunity to request effective protection; (c) has relatives there and may enter the territory of the country; or (d) has been requested for extradition by a safe third country.¹⁷⁸ In practice transit or stay is a sufficient connection, even in cases where a person was smuggled through and did not know the country at all.

2.2. Procedural guarantees

In the event of applying the “safe third country” concept, the applicant, when this fact is communicated to him or her, can declare immediately but within 3 days at the latest why in his or her individual case, the specific country does not qualify as a safe third country.¹⁷⁹ The law does not specify in which format

¹⁷⁸ Section 51(3) Asylum Act.

¹⁷⁹ Section 51(11) Asylum Act.

and language this information should be communicated to the applicant, if an interpreter should be made available, or if a written record should be prepared. In the **Röszke** transit zone, the case officers refused to take submissions that are not written in English (see [Border Procedure](#)). Equally, the law does not specify the format or language, the availability of interpreters, and the preparation of a written record pertaining to applicants' "declaration" either. No mandatory, free-of-charge legal assistance is foreseen for this process. Due to the lack of a functioning legal aid system accessible to asylum seekers, the vast majority of them have no access to professional legal aid during the asylum procedure.

In the case that the application is declared inadmissible on safe third country grounds, the IAO shall issue a certificate in the official language of that third country to the applicant that his or her application for asylum was not assessed on the merits.¹⁸⁰ This guarantee was respected in practice. Where the safe third country fails to take back the applicant, the refugee authority shall withdraw its decision and continue the procedure (see section on the [Admissibility Procedure](#), where problems regarding the use of these safeguards are described).¹⁸¹

2.3. The list of safe third countries

In July 2015, Hungary amended its asylum legislation in various aspects and adopted a National List of Safe third Countries.¹⁸² Following a subsequent amendment to the list, the following countries are currently considered safe third countries:

- EU Member States
- EU candidate countries
- Member States of the European Economic Area
- US States that do not have the death penalty
- Switzerland
- Bosnia-Herzegovina
- Kosovo
- Canada
- Australia
- New Zealand

The list includes, amongst others, Serbia. However, in August 2012, UNHCR has said that it "recommends that Serbia not be considered a safe third country of asylum, and that countries therefore refrain from sending asylum seekers back to Serbia on this basis",¹⁸³ a position it still maintains today.¹⁸⁴ Besides, aside from the fact that the Asylum Act authorises the Government to establish a national list of safe third countries, Hungary does not otherwise appear to have laid down rules in its national law on the methodology by which the competent authorities may satisfy themselves that a third country may be designated as a safe third country within the meaning of Section 2(i) of the Act. Nor is any explanation or justification provided in Government Decree 191/2015 as to how the Government arrived to the conclusion that each country listed qualifies as safe.¹⁸⁵ Moreover, the designation as a "safe third country" contradicts the guidelines of the Hungarian Supreme Court ("*Kúria*") and the evidence provided by the reports of the HHC,¹⁸⁶ Serbian human rights organisations,¹⁸⁷ and Amnesty International.¹⁸⁸ Currently there is no other EU Member State that regards Serbia as a safe third country for asylum seekers.

¹⁸⁰ Section 51(6) Asylum Act.

¹⁸¹ Section 51A Asylum Act.

¹⁸² Government Decree 191/2015 (VII. 21.) on the national list of safe countries of origin and safe third countries. The original list did not include **Turkey**, but the country was later inserted.

¹⁸³ UNHCR, *Serbia as a country of asylum: Observations on the situation of asylum-seekers and beneficiaries of international protection in Serbia*, August 2012, available at: <http://bit.ly/1V6O23I>, 22.

¹⁸⁴ UNHCR, *Hungary as a country of asylum*, May 2016.

¹⁸⁵ *Ibid*, para 36.

¹⁸⁶ HHC, *Serbia as a Safe Third Country: Revisited: An update of the Hungarian Helsinki Committee's 2011 report*, June 2012, available at: <http://bit.ly/1N9p2lo>.

¹⁸⁷ See e.g. AIDA, Country Report Serbia, 2017 Update, February 2018.

¹⁸⁸ Amnesty International, *Europe's Borderlands*, 6 July 2015, available at: <http://bit.ly/1dLK66T>.

The Supreme Court of Hungary issued an official opinion on 10 December 2012 in order to promote a harmonised practice within Hungarian courts regarding the application of the safe third country concept in asylum cases.¹⁸⁹ The concrete reason for issuing such a guidance document was that, in recent years, different Hungarian regional courts applied different approaches upon reviewing inadmissibility decisions on that ground. This also meant a diverging evaluation of the asylum situation in Serbia, the target country of most “safe third country” returns of asylum seekers from Hungary.

On the issue of the country of origin information used to determine if a country is safe, the Supreme Court stated that:

“When reviewing administrative decisions regarding the application of the safe third country concept the court shall *ex officio* take into consideration the precise and credible country information at its disposal at the time of deciding, obtained in any of its procedures. In this context, the country information issued by the UNHCR shall always be taken into consideration. In case of doubt, [...] the court may approach the country information service of the Office of Immigration and Nationality or it may obtain information from other reliable sources. [...]”

The Supreme Court also stated that the fact that a certain country ratified the relevant international treaties is *per se* irrelevant when assessing the ‘safety’ of a country, since the application of these treaties in practice shall also be examined.

In 2016, the Kúria’s aforementioned opinion was withdrawn,¹⁹⁰ on the ground that legislation has since changed and its application based on current asylum and migration laws is no longer possible. Moreover, the Qualification and Asylum Procedures Directives in effect at the time of the 2012 Opinion have been amended. Since the previous opinion was based on a different legal and factual basis, it was deemed not to be applicable any longer.

In 2016 the practice of the courts regarding the inadmissibility decisions based on Serbia being a safe third country varied. The Szeged Court, after the withdrawal of the Kúria’s position, started to reject almost all appeals, but its practice reversed again towards the end of the year. The Budapest Court’s practice was inconsistent throughout the year. UNHCR sent a letter to all relevant courts, reaffirming its position on Serbia not being a safe third country for asylum seekers. Despite this letter, the courts continued to issue negative decisions in several cases.

The Asylum Act obliges the IAO to reject as inadmissible all asylum claims lodged by applicants who came through a safe third country, since the applicant “could have applied for effective protection there”. As over 95% of asylum seekers enters Hungary at the Serbian-Hungarian border section, this means the quasi-automatic rejection at first glance of over 95% of asylum claims, without any consideration of protection needs.

In individual cases, the presumption of having had an opportunity to ask for asylum in Serbia is – in principle – rebuttable. However, this possibility is likely to remain theoretical for a number of reasons:

- The law requires the applicant to prove that he or she could not present an asylum claim in Serbia.¹⁹¹ This represents an unrealistically high standard of proof (as compared to the lower standard of “to substantiate”, which is generally applied in Hungarian asylum law). An asylum seeker typically smuggled through a country unknown to him or her is extremely unlikely to have any verifiable, “hard” evidence to prove such a statement;
- The impossibility to have access to protection in Serbia does not stem from individual circumstances, but from the general lack of a functioning asylum system. Therefore, it is absurd

¹⁸⁹ Supreme Court of Hungary, Opinion no. 2/2012 (xii.10) KMK on certain questions related to the application of the safe third country concept, 10 December 2012, available at: <http://bit.ly/1dAn6YJ>.

¹⁹⁰ Supreme Court of Hungary, Opinion no. 1/2016 (iii.21) KMK on certain questions related to the application of the safe third country concept, available at: <http://bit.ly/2kQZXpa>.

¹⁹¹ Section 51(5) Asylum Act.

and conceptually impossible to expect an asylum seeker to prove that, for individual reasons, he or she had no access to a functioning system in Serbia which in reality does not exist;

- If the claim is considered inadmissible, the IAO has to deliver a decision in maximum 15 days (8 days at the border).¹⁹² This extremely short deadline adds to the presumption that no individualised assessment will be carried out.
- These amendments not only breach the definition of “safe third country” under EU and Hungarian law,¹⁹³ but they also led, in practice, to the massive violation of Hungary’s *non-refoulement* and protection obligations enshrined in the 1951 Refugee Convention, Article 3 ECHR, and Articles 18 and 19 of the EU Charter of Fundamental Rights. Since early 2015, the vast majority of asylum seekers have come to Hungary from the worst crises of the world (Afghanistan, Syria and Iraq). Most of them had no opportunity to explain why they had to flee. Instead, they were exposed to the risk of an immediate removal to Serbia, a country where protection is currently not available. This means that they were deprived of the mere possibility to find protection and at the real risk of chain refoulement.

In the middle of 2017, the Hungarian authorities stopped issuing inadmissibility decisions based on safe third country grounds. Reasons for the change of practice are unknown.

On 14 March 2017 the European Court of Human Rights issued a judgment in the *Ilias and Ahmed v. Hungary* case and found a violation of Article 3 ECHR in respect of the applicants’ return to Serbia based on safe third country grounds, because of the exposure to the risk of chain-*refoulement*. The Court stated that the Hungarian authorities failed to carry out an individual assessment of each applicant’s case, did not take their share of the burden of proof and placed the applicants in a position where they were not able to rebut the presumption of safety, since the Government’s arguments remained confined to the ‘schematic reference’ to the inclusion of Serbia in the national list of safe countries. The Court emphasized that relying on the Decree is not a sufficient reason to consider a country a safe third country and that the ratification of the 1951 Refugee Convention is not a sufficient condition to qualify a country as safe. The government’s appeal against the judgment is currently pending at the Grand Chamber of the ECtHR.

3. Safe country of origin

Section 2(h) of the Asylum Act explains a “safe country of origin” as a country included in a list of countries approved by the Council of the EU or “the national list stipulated by a Government Decree”, or part of that country.

The presence of a country in such a list is “a rebuttable presumption with regard to the applicant according to which no persecution is experienced in general and systematically in that country or in a part of that country, no torture, cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment is applied, and an efficient system of legal remedy is in place to address any injury of such rights or freedoms.”

If the applicant’s country of origin is regarded as “safe”, the application will be rejected in the accelerated procedure (see [Accelerated Procedure](#)).¹⁹⁴ In the event of applying the accelerated procedure to an applicant originating from safe country of origin, the applicant, when this fact is communicated to him or her, can declare immediately but within 3 days at the latest why in his or her individual case, the specific country does not qualify as a safe country of origin.¹⁹⁵ Where the safe country of origin fails to take over the applicant, the refugee authority shall withdraw its decision and continue the procedure.¹⁹⁶

¹⁹² Section 47(2) Asylum Act.

¹⁹³ Recital 46 and Article 38 recast Asylum Procedures Directive; Section 2(i) Asylum Act.

¹⁹⁴ Section 59(1) Asylum Act.

¹⁹⁵ Section 51(11) Asylum Act.

¹⁹⁶ Section 51A Asylum Act.

In July 2015, Hungary amended its asylum legislation in various aspects and adopted a National List of Safe Countries of Origin,¹⁹⁷ which are the following:

- EU Member States
- EU candidate countries
- Member States of the European Economic Area
- US States that do not have the death penalty
- Switzerland
- Bosnia-Herzegovina
- Kosovo
- Canada
- Australia
- New Zealand

G. Relocation

Indicators: Relocation

1. Number of persons effectively relocated since the start of the scheme 0

Hungary has not applied the relocation scheme to date, and has brought an action before the CJEU to challenge the legality of Council Decision 2015/1601, which was dismissed by the Court on 6 September 2017.¹⁹⁸ By the end of 2017, the European Commission decided to move forward on the infringement procedure initiated against Hungary for non-compliance with the EU relocation scheme and decided to refer Hungary, Czech Republic and Poland to the CJEU.¹⁹⁹

H. Information for asylum seekers and access to NGOs and UNHCR

Indicators: Information and Access to NGOs and UNHCR

1. Is sufficient information provided to asylum seekers on the procedures, their rights and obligations in practice? ☐ Yes ☒ With difficulty ☐ No
 - ❖ Is tailored information provided to unaccompanied children? ☐ Yes ☒ No
2. Do asylum seekers located at the border have effective access to NGOs and UNHCR if they wish so in practice?
 - ❖ UNHCR ☒ Yes ☐ With difficulty ☐ No
 - ❖ NGOs ☐ Yes ☒ With difficulty ☐ No
3. Do asylum seekers in detention centres have effective access to NGOs and UNHCR if they wish so in practice? ☐ Yes ☐ With difficulty ☒ No
4. Do asylum seekers accommodated in remote locations on the territory (excluding borders) have effective access to NGOs and UNHCR if they wish so in practice? ☒ Yes ☐ With difficulty ☐ No

The IAO is obliged to provide written information to the asylum seeker upon submission of the application. The information concerns the applicant's rights and obligations in the procedure and the consequences of violating these obligations.²⁰⁰

¹⁹⁷ Government Decree 191/2015 (VII. 21.) on the national list of safe countries of origin and safe third countries.

¹⁹⁸ CJEU, Joined Cases C-643/15 and C-647/15, *Slovakia and Hungary v Council*, Judgment of 6 September 2017.

¹⁹⁹ European Commission, 'Relocation: Commission refers the Czech Republic, Hungary and Poland to the Court of Justice', IP/17/5002, 7 December 2017, available at: <http://bit.ly/2j0Mlw8>.

²⁰⁰ Section 37 Asylum Act.

The same level and sources of information are used in all stages of the asylum procedure. Asylum seekers also receive information about the Dublin Regulation. The level of understanding of the information varies a lot amongst asylum seekers, while in some instances the functioning of the Dublin III system is too complicated to comprehend. Common leaflets drawn up by the Commission are already used in practice.

The asylum seeker is informed about the fact that a Dublin procedure has started, but after that, he or she is not informed about the different steps in the Dublin procedure. If the Dublin procedure takes a long time, this creates frustration, especially since all asylum seekers are detained. The HHC lawyers have reported that this information is not even contained in the applicants' files. In order to obtain such information, the legal representatives need a special power of attorney. Asylum seekers only receive the decision on the transfer which includes the grounds for application of the Dublin Regulation and against which they can appeal within 3 days. The IAO does not provide a written translation of the Dublin decision, but they do explain it orally in a language that the asylum seeker understands. Some asylum seekers have told the HHC that they were not informed about the possibility to appeal the Dublin decision when they were given the decision.

The main factors that render access to information difficult are: (a) untimely provision of the information enabling asylum seekers to make an informed choice; (b) language barriers; (c) illiteracy; (d) failure to address specific needs of asylum seekers, e.g. by using child- and disability-friendly communication; and (e) highly complex and technical wording of official information material.²⁰¹ Frequently, information is not provided in user-friendly language, and written communication is the main means of information provision, although it has been shown to be less effective than video material. The HHC's experience shows that alternative sources of information are rarely used in practice.

With the support of UNHCR, the HHC has published a short leaflet for the transit zones in 7 languages.²⁰²

In October 2017, the authorities terminated cooperation agreements with the HHC and denied access to police detention, prisons and immigration detention after two decades of cooperation and over 2,000 visits. The HHC can no longer monitor human rights in closed institutions, even though NGOs' access to police, prison and immigration detention reduces the risk of torture and ill-treatment and contributes to improving detention conditions.²⁰³ Regarding the access of HHC lawyers for the purpose to provide legal aid, see [Regular Procedure: Legal Assistance](#).

²⁰¹ See also the highly technical language used in IAO's website on the asylum procedure, available at: <http://bit.ly/1e5AtBi>, and Dublin, available at: <http://bit.ly/1L3fA7b>. No tailored information to children is provided online.

²⁰² HHC, *Asylum at the Hungarian border*, available in 7 languages at: <https://www.helsinki.hu/en/info/>.

²⁰³ HHC, *National authorities terminated cooperation agreements with the Hungarian Helsinki Committee*, available at: <http://bit.ly/2sMyU7o>.

I. Differential treatment of specific nationalities in the procedure

Indicators: Treatment of Specific Nationalities

1. Are applications from specific nationalities considered manifestly well-founded? ☒ Yes ☐ No
❖ If yes, specify which: Syria, Eritrea, Somalia
2. Are applications from specific nationalities considered manifestly unfounded?²⁰⁴ ☒ Yes ☐ No
❖ If yes, specify which: EEA countries, EU candidate countries, Albania, Bosnia-Herzegovina, FYROM, Kosovo, Montenegro, Serbia, Canada, Australia, New Zealand, US states that do not have the death penalty

There is a national list of safe countries of origin (see section on [Safe Country of Origin](#)).

Recognition rates for those arriving from war- and terror-torn countries remain low, counting inadmissibility decisions. Those getting protection mainly get subsidiary protection (Afghans: 20 refugees, 509 subsidiary protection, 1,220 refused protection; Somalis: 1 refugee, 11 subsidiary protection, 3 refused protection; Syrians: 10 refugees, 374 subsidiary protection; 573 refused protection; Iraqis: 10 refugees, 168 subsidiary protection, 510 refused protection). In 2017, 1,216 asylum seekers were granted protection (of which 106 were refugee and 1,110 were subsidiary protection statuses) while 2,880 applications were rejected (see section on [Statistics](#)).²⁰⁵

Regarding differential treatment, the HHC observed that Syrian asylum seekers who have no original ID documents usually receive protection very fast, in 3-4 weeks.

²⁰⁴ Whether under the “safe country of origin” concept or otherwise.

²⁰⁵ HHC, *Key asylum figures as of 1 January 2018*, available at: <http://bit.ly/2mkueyK>.

Reception Conditions

A. Access and forms of reception conditions

1. Criteria and restrictions to access reception conditions

Indicators: Criteria and Restrictions to Reception Conditions

1. Does the law make material reception conditions to asylum seekers in the following stages of the asylum procedure?

❖ Regular procedure	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Reduced material conditions	<input type="checkbox"/> No
❖ Dublin procedure	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Reduced material conditions	<input type="checkbox"/> No
❖ Border procedure	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Reduced material conditions	<input type="checkbox"/> No
❖ Appeal	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Reduced material conditions	<input type="checkbox"/> No
❖ Subsequent application	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Reduced material conditions	<input type="checkbox"/> No
2. Is there a requirement in the law that only asylum seekers who lack resources are entitled to material reception conditions?

	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
--	---	-----------------------------

Asylum seekers who are first-time applicants were entitled to material reception conditions during the entire asylum procedure until the final and effective conclusion of the asylum procedure.²⁰⁶ However, since 28 March 2017, first-time asylum seekers without lawful Hungarian residence or visa have been placed exclusively in the transit zones immediately after claiming asylum where they are entitled only to reduced material conditions (see [Conditions in Detention Facilities](#)). Asylum seekers who enter the transit zones can no longer request to stay in private accommodation at their own cost.²⁰⁷

Those asylum seekers who are residing lawfully in the country and do not ask to be placed in a reception centre still have the right to request private accommodation as their designated place to stay. In the latter case, asylum seekers are not provided with any material reception condition since their subsistence is deemed to be ensured.

Only those asylum seekers who are deemed to be destitute are entitled to material reception conditions free of charge.²⁰⁸ If an asylum seeker is not destitute, the asylum authority may decide to order that the applicant pay for the full or partial costs of material conditions and health care. The level of resources is, however, not established in the Asylum Act and applicants have to make a statement regarding their financial situation. Presently, this condition does not pose an obstacle to accessing reception conditions. Pursuant to the March 2017 amendments, the provisions of [Reduction or Withdrawal of Material Reception Conditions](#) set out in Sections 30 and 31 of the Asylum Act are not applicable anymore, although reception conditions are *ex lege* reduced.

According to the amended Asylum Act,²⁰⁹ subsequent applicants shall not be entitled to exercise the right to aid, support and accommodation.²¹⁰ Although in practice since transit zones are the compulsory places of confinement, therefore accommodation (a bed in a container) was always ensured for asylum seekers. Regarding the provision of food and other material support, subsequent applicants placed in the transit zones can only count on the aid of civil organisations and churches having access to the transit zones (see [Subsequent Applications](#)).²¹¹

²⁰⁶ Section 27 Asylum Act.

²⁰⁷ Section 80/I(d) Asylum Act.

²⁰⁸ Section 26(2) Asylum Act.

²⁰⁹ Section 80/K(11) Asylum Act.

²¹⁰ Set out in Section 5(1) a-c) Asylum Act.

²¹¹ HHC, *Turbulent 50 days – an update on the Hungarian asylum situation*, 22 May 2017, available at: <http://bit.ly/2EFxDAo>.

2. Forms and levels of material reception conditions

Indicators: Forms and Levels of Material Reception Conditions

1. Amount of the weekly financial allowance/vouchers granted to asylum seekers for hygienic items and food allowance in **Kiskunhalas** (in original currency and €):
 - ❖ Single adults / Children above age of 3: HUF 6,650 (€21.36)
 - ❖ Pregnant women, women with child below age of 3: HUF 7,000 (€22.48)

According to the March 2017 amendments, under the state of crisis due to mass migration, asylum seekers no longer receive financial allowance and the reimbursement of expenses concerning education had been modified.

Since 1 April, 2016 asylum seekers are not entitled to receive pocket money.

Since 28 March 2017 there has been – apart from a few others who left the reception facility after some days – only one asylum seeker staying in **Kiskunhalas** who has not been receiving any food or hygienic items owing to the regulation concerning the lack of reception conditions of subsequent asylum seekers.

In **Balassagyarmat** asylum seekers are provided with hygienic items and food and do not receive financial allowance.

Asylum seekers residing in reception centres receive:²¹²

- Accommodation;
- According to the law, 3 meals per day.

HHC is aware of an asylum seeker woman residing in **Vámosszabadi** with her approximately 1-year-old child who only has a right to reside in the reception centre, but is denied food in kind or a financial allowance. The single woman with her child can exclusively count on the help of volunteers and NGOs' services being present in Vámosszabadi.

3. Reduction or withdrawal of reception conditions

Indicators: Reduction or Withdrawal of Reception Conditions

1. Does the law provide for the possibility to reduce material reception conditions?
☒ Yes ☐ No
2. Does the legislation provide for the possibility to withdraw material reception conditions?
☒ Yes ☐ No

With the effect of the March 2017 amendments, Sections 30 and 31 of the Asylum Act shall not be applied in the current state of crisis due to mass migration. Pursuant to the legislative changes no decisions were issued on the reduction or the withdrawal of the reception conditions in 2017.²¹³

Otherwise, Section 30(1) lays down the grounds for reducing and withdrawing material reception conditions. These include cases where the applicant:

- (a) Leaves the private housing designated for him or her for an unknown destination, for a period of at least 15 days;
- (b) Deceives the authorities regarding his or her financial situation and thus unlawfully benefits from reception;
- (c) Lodges a subsequent application with the same factual elements; or
- (d) Does not comply with reporting obligations relating to the asylum procedure, does not supply the required data or information or fails to appear at personal hearings.

²¹² Sections 21-22 Asylum Decree.

²¹³ Information provided by IAO, 12 February 2018.

The IAO may consider sanctions in designating a place of accommodation if the person seeking recognition grossly violates the rules of conduct in force at the designated place of accommodation, or manifests seriously violent behaviour.²¹⁴

A decision of reduction or withdrawal is made by the IAO and is based on a consideration of the individual circumstances of the person. The decision contains the reasoning. The reduction can be in the form of retaining the monthly financial allowance. The reduction or the withdrawal should be proportionate to the violation committed and can be ordered for a definite or for an indefinite period of time with a possibility of judicial review.²¹⁵ If circumstances have changed, reception conditions can be provided again. The request for judicial review shall be submitted within 3 days and it does not have a suspensive effect. The applicant has a right to free legal assistance.

According to Section 39(7) of the Asylum Decree, if asylum seekers turn out to have substantial assets or funds, they will be required to reimburse the IAO for the costs of reception. If the sum value of the benefits and services is received without entitlement, the IAO shall order the collection of the sum repayable – and treated as outstanding public dues enforced as taxes – unless it is repaid voluntarily.²¹⁶

As of January 2018 recuperation of financial claims will be ordered by the IAO and implemented via the national tax authority.²¹⁷ According to Section 32/Y(4) of the Asylum Act the person concerned shall be required to pay a default penalty if he or she has failed to comply with a payment obligation. There is no independent remedy set out in the law against such an enforcement order issued by IAO.²¹⁸

4. Freedom of movement

Indicators: Freedom of Movement

1. Is there a mechanism for the dispersal of applicants across the territory of the country?
☐ Yes ☒ No
2. Does the law provide for restrictions on freedom of movement? ☒ Yes ☐ No

Until March 2017, asylum seekers were allocated to a specific facility through a dispersal scheme managed by the IAO. When the March 2017 amendments came into effect, those asylum seekers who had already had an ongoing procedure and stayed in Hungary remained in open camps with the same material conditions as ensured before. Currently there are only a few asylum seekers residing in open facilities (see [Types of Accommodation](#)).

Asylum seekers who are not detained can move freely within the country, but may only leave the reception centre where they are accommodated for less than 24 hours, unless they notify the authorities in writing about their intention to leave the facility for more than 24h. In this case the IAO upon the request issues the permission for the asylum seekers. HHC is not aware of any difficulty in this regard.

The March 2017 amendments prescribed that in state of crisis of mass migration, Section 48(1) of the Asylum Act regulating accommodation at a private address is not applicable. Therefore the request for private accommodation of an asylum seeker accommodated alone in **Kiskunhalas** was rejected several times by the IAO.

In the **Balassagyarmat** community shelter, a new curfew has been introduced which allows asylum seekers to leave the facility for only 2 hours per day.

The relocation of applicants was not a common practice in 2017. Since transit zones serve as reception centres in the first place, there have been only a few exceptional cases when asylum seekers were

²¹⁴ Section 30(2) Asylum Act.

²¹⁵ Section 31 Asylum Act.

²¹⁶ Section 26(5) Asylum Act.

²¹⁷ Section 32/Y Asylum Act.

²¹⁸ Section 32/Y(1) Asylum Act.

transferred from **Röszke** or **Tompa** to open reception facilities. HHC is aware of a case of an Iraqi woman with her 5-year-old son who was placed in **Kiskunhalas** after her unsuccessful suicide attempt in the transit zone. There has been another case where an Afghan woman with her husband and children were placed in Röszke transit zone even though the applicant gave an account of her serious depression disorder already at her personal hearing when they entered the transit zone in mid-August 2017. The family was represented by the lawyer of HHC who requested several times the transfer of the family to an open reception facility due to the poor mental health state of the woman but was rejected by IAO at every time. She was provided with limited psychological assistance but she was not provided with any interpreter service. After the unsuccessful suicide attempt of the woman carried out in the beginning of December 2017, the family was finally transported to Kiskunhalas. Other cases were also noted by HHC when applicants under outgoing Dublin procedures were placed to **Balassagyarmat** after a Western EU Member State had taken responsibility in order to wait for the transfer there. In general, those who were released from the transit zones after a few days left Hungary.

In 2017, an asylum seeker from the Democratic Republic of Congo appealed, with the help of an HHC attorney, against the IAO decision assigning **Körmend** as place of residence. The decision was successfully challenged before the Court and resulted in the relocation of the client to **Vámosszabadi**.

B. Housing

1. Types of accommodation

Indicators: Types of Accommodation

1. Number of reception centres:²¹⁹ 3
2. Total number of places in the reception centres: 550
3. Total number of places in private accommodation: N/A
4. Type of accommodation most frequently used in a regular procedure:
☐ Reception centre ☐ Hotel ☐ Emergency shelter ☐ Private housing ☒ Transit zone
5. Type of accommodation most frequently used in an accelerated procedure:
☐ Reception centre ☐ Hotel ☐ Emergency shelter ☐ Private housing ☒ Transit zone

As of 31 December 2017, there are 3 restricted reception centres out of 4 open reception centres and 1 home for unaccompanied children in Hungary. The four reception centres are:

Reception Centre	Location	Maximum capacity	Occupancy at end 2017
Balassagyarmat	Near Slovakian border	140	49
Kiskunhalas (temporary)	Szeged, near Serbian border	200	14
Körmend (temporary)	Near Austrian border	operation suspended	operation suspended
Vámosszabadi	Near Slovakian border	210	57
Total		550	120

The numbers in the table above clearly point out that apart from a handful of asylum seekers who were either exceptionally accommodated in reception centres or have already had an ongoing asylum procedure when the March 2017 amendments entered into force, asylum seekers are mainly detained in the transit zones, unless they are residing lawfully in the territory of Hungary (see [Access to the Territory](#) and [Place of Detention](#)).

A dramatic decrease can be observed in the numbers of asylum seekers, as after February 2017 many applicants left Hungary owing to the fear that they could have been taken to the transit zones pursuant

²¹⁹ Both permanent and for first arrivals.

to the March 2017 amendments.²²⁰ Ultimately, no transfers from open reception facilities to the transit zones have either been issued or carried out;²²¹ the HHC successfully obtained 2 interim measures from the ECtHR preventing transfer of unaccompanied children and a pregnant woman from open reception centres to the transit zones. However, HHC observed examples when applicants were “released” there from asylum detention.

The closure of open reception facilities has been a pattern since 2016 when first **Nagyfa** was closed in August 2016 and then **Bicske**, the closest reception to Budapest, was closed in December 2016. After a harsh winter, the operation of Körmend tent camp was also suspended in May 2017. **Balassagyarmat**, **Kiskunhalas**, and **Vámosszabadi** are still operating with a limited capacity.

Balassagyarmat is a community shelter with a maximum capacity of 140 places for asylum seekers, persons tolerated to stay, persons in immigration procedure and foreigners who have exceeded 12 months in immigration detention, and now also receives beneficiaries of international protection.

Kiskunhalas reception centre was opened in July 2016 with a maximum capacity of 200 places. Asylum seekers are hosted in containers and the camp is surrounded by a 4-5 meter high wire fence; the facility formerly functioned as an immigration detention centre.

These reception facilities mainly accommodate asylum seekers whose procedures had started even before the transit regime took effect and have a symbolic role in maintaining these open reception centres. For example, between July and December 2017, apart from three applicants who temporarily stayed there for a short period of time, there was only one asylum seeker residing in Kiskunhalas.

Vámosszabadi is hosting exclusively those asylum seekers whose cases had been launched before the March 2017 Amendments, while **Balassagyarmat** is functioning mainly for those with ongoing Dublin cases in the transit zones, who are then transferred on to Balassagyarmat where they wait for transfer to Western EU Member States. Both centres also host people who receive protection status and are therefore released from the transit zones (they have a right to be accommodated in a reception centre for one month after the recognition).

Körmend reception centre was opened on 2 May 2016 with a maximum capacity of 280 places due to the extended numbers of asylum seekers and the lack of space in the existing facilities. The camp consisted of military tents. It was initially meant as a temporary facility but – not considering the extremely cold weather – it was used throughout the winter of 2016-2017 to accommodate asylum seekers. Only single men were accommodated here. On 10 May 2016, there were 202 asylum seekers in Körmend reception centre. However, by November 2016, the number of asylum seekers had decreased to just 10-15 and then to just 1 person by April 2017. This radical decline is clearly due to the extremely dire and inhuman conditions, since all asylum seekers, without exception, complained about the extremely low temperatures in the tents.²²²

The centres are managed by the IAO.²²³ The reception centres operate financially under the direction of the Director-General as an independent department and perform their professional tasks under the supervision of the Refugee Affairs Directorate of the IAO. Therefore only one central body, the IAO, is responsible for the financial operation and the professional duties of the reception centres. Nevertheless, NGOs who work in the field of asylum cooperate with the refugee authority in providing supplementary services for applicants.

Unaccompanied children below the age of fourteen are not placed in the transit zones but are accommodated in **Fót**. Fót is a home for unaccompanied children located in the North of Budapest,

²²⁰ The reform prescribed that asylum seekers residing in open reception centres or at private accommodation should also be transferred to the transit zones.

²²¹ HHC, *Turbulent 50 days – an update on the Hungarian asylum situation*, 22 May 2017, available at: <http://bit.ly/2EFxDAo>.

²²² HHC, *Report on Körmend*, 18 November 2016, available at: <http://bit.ly/2jzsT3T>.

²²³ Section 12(3) Asylum Decree.

which belongs to the Ministry of Human Resources and can host 50 children.²²⁴ Unaccompanied children beyond the age of 14 are detained in the transit zones as it is detailed in Section on Detention. **Hódmezővásárhely** was a small house for unaccompanied children maintained by a Catholic charity under a contract with the Ministry. The contract terminated at the end of March 2016 and since then Fót has remained the only reception facility for unaccompanied children.

2. Conditions in reception facilities

Indicators: Conditions in Reception Facilities

1. Are there instances of asylum seekers not having access to reception accommodation because of a shortage of places? ☐ Yes ☒ No
2. What is the average length of stay of asylum seekers in the reception centres? N/A
3. Are unaccompanied children ever accommodated with adults in practice? ☐ Yes ☒ No

Until the end of year 2017, it had not been the case that asylum seekers were left without accommodation due to a shortage of places in reception centres.

2.1. Overall conditions

Unlike detention centres (see section on [Conditions in Detention Facilities](#)), the legal standards regulating open reception premises are defined in separate instruments.²²⁵ Conditions in reception centres differ. In all centres, residents get 3 meals per day. As a result of the limited number of asylum seekers and beneficiaries of international protection people can cook for themselves in every facility. Religious diets are respected in all facilities. There is no regulation on the amount of nutrition value necessary for the reception centres, contrary to the detention centres.

In all centres, regular cleaning is arranged and the number of toilets and showers are sufficient in all facilities during regular occupancy. Nonetheless in **Vámosszabadi** toilet and shower facilities are raising concerns relating to hygiene and possible spread of diseases. Not every door is lockable which can easily amount to unsecured privacy.

Residents share rooms or containers. The minimum surface area that should be available is outlined in national legislation only for the community shelters i.e. **Balassagyarmat**. The relevant Decree provides that the community shelter must have at least 15 m³ of air space and 5 m² of floor space per person.²²⁶ Families are accommodated in family rooms.

There have been no problems reported in connection to the practicing of religion.

Asylum seekers can go outside whenever they want except in **Balassagyarmat** where a strict curfew has been introduced recently. In **Vámosszabadi**, the IAO provides also direct free bus transport to Győr, the nearest big town, for the residents of the community shelter. In **Kiskunhalas**, access to the town is not ensured since there is no public transport available and there is not even a pavement.

Social and community workers in the reception facilities sometimes organise different activities for asylum seekers e.g. drawing, music activities, film clubs, cooking or sport events. However, such activities are project-based and occur only if there is a funded project. Every facility has computers and community rooms. Kiskunhalas is lacking sport fields though. Some have a playground as well. In **Vámosszabadi**, the social workers have also organised a small library and Hungarian language classes are organised, as well.

²²⁴ The Ministry of Human Resources' website is available at: <http://bit.ly/1IN7PSI>.

²²⁵ EASO, *Description of the Hungarian asylum system*, May 2015, 10.

²²⁶ Section 131 Asylum Decree.

In each facility, medical services are available. However, asylum seekers complain about the lack of interpretation services when accessing medical services. In Vámoszabadi interpreters provided by SOS Children's Villages assist asylum seekers when accessing medical services.

2.2. Duration of stay in reception centres

The average length of time spent in reception facilities for asylum seekers that did not leave before the end of their procedure is not available for 2017, but may be estimated at a few days or weeks. Nonetheless there are asylum seekers whose procedures had been started more than two years ago and as a result of the lack of effective remedy these people are still struggling to obtain international protection.

C. Employment and education

1. Access to the labour market

Indicators: Access to the Labour Market

1. Does the law allow for access to the labour market for asylum seekers? ☐ Yes ☒ No

As a result of the March 2017 amendments,²²⁷ in the current state of crisis due to mass migration asylum seekers no longer have access to the labour market. They are neither entitled to work in the premises of the reception centres nor at any other work place. The new regulation is clearly in violation of Article 15 of the recast Reception Conditions Directive.

The March 2017 amendments are applicable in ongoing asylum procedures, and those asylum seekers who were to be entitled to work because 9 months had passed since their procedure started have also been excluded from access to the labour market.

Outside of the application of state of crisis due to mass migration, according to the regulations previously in force asylum seekers could work in the premises of the reception centre, without obtaining a work permit. Only after 9 months could asylum seekers also work outside the centres, in accordance with the general rules applicable to foreigners.

The employer had to request a work permit – valid for 1 year and renewable – from the local employment office. Asylum seekers could only apply for jobs which were not taken by Hungarians or nationals of the European Economic Area, therefore subject to a labour market test.

2. Access to education

Indicators: Access to Education

1. Does the law provide for access to education for asylum-seeking children? ☒ Yes ☐ No
2. Are children able to access education in practice? ☒ Yes ☐ No

The Public Education Act provides for compulsory education (kindergarten or school) to asylum seeking and refugee children under the age of 16 staying or residing in Hungary. Children have access to kindergarten and school education under the same conditions as Hungarian children. Schooling is only compulsory until the age of 16.²²⁸ As a consequence, asylum-seeking children above the age of 16 are not offered the possibility to attend school, until they receive a protection status. NGOs such as the Menedék Association offer alternative forms of education to children who are not yet enrolled in school.

²²⁷ Section 80/J(4) Asylum Act.

²²⁸ Section 45(3) Act CXC of 2011 on public education.

Children at the age of 6 are enrolled in local schools of towns where the reception centres are located, which host a special preparatory language learning class in order for children to later join regular classes. Difficulties have been reported relating to the availability of places in public schools.

Refugee children are often not enrolled in the normal classes with Hungarian pupils but placed in special preparatory classes. Integration with the Hungarian children therefore remains limited. They can move from these special classes once their level of Hungarian is sufficient. However, there are only a few institutions which accept such children and are able to provide appropriate programmes according to their specific needs, education level and language knowledge. According to the experience of the Menedék Hungarian Association for Migrants, many local schools are reluctant to receive foreign children as (a) they lack the necessary capacity and expertise to provide additional tutoring to asylum-seeking children; and (b) Hungarian families would voice their adversarial feelings towards the reception of asylum-seeking children.²²⁹ This is a clear sign of intolerance of the Hungarian society in general. In some other cases, the local school only accepts asylum seeking children in segregated classes but without a meaningful pedagogical programme and only for 2 hours a day, which is significantly less than the 5-7 hours per day that Hungarian students spend in school.

Moreover, if the asylum seeking child has special needs, they rarely have access to special education because of the language barriers.

Unaccompanied children in **Fót** attend the Than Karoly Secondary School or the Bródy Imre Secondary School in Budapest. Children attending the Bródy Imre School reported that they only have access to school 2 days a week, although they would like and need to learn more. In addition, several children were not issued the necessary documentation for schooling. Children located in the Károlyi István Children's Home find it hard to enrol in formal education for a number of reasons, such as the delays in providing them with documents (such as an ID card) and the lack of available capacity in the few schools which accept unaccompanied minors. The increasing number of very young unaccompanied minors also places a heavy burden on the educational system and sheds light on systemic shortcomings such as the lack of an elementary school willing and able to enrol young asylum seeking children.

In **Kiskunhalas** the access to mainstream education is available, and school materials are provided. In practice though, even if families are placed there they leave the camp sooner than children could have had the opportunity to be enrolled in education.

Full access to mainstream education is hindered in **Vámosszabadi**, where two (one school age and one kindergarten age) children did not have access to primary education, and could not attend school on the grounds that their asylum application was rejected and they were awaiting deportation in 2015. In 2017 the general experience of HHC was that there were no asylum seeking children placed in Vámosszabadi.

In **Balassagyarmat** only one girl could start attending a local school in April 2014. For the rest of the school aged children staying there, no arrangement has yet been made with the local schools. There is a school operating at the premises of the community shelter, where resident children can be enrolled.

Education opportunities and vocational training for adults is only offered once they have a protection status. In practice asylum seekers can sometimes attend Hungarian language classes offered by NGOs for free of charge.

Before September 2017, education as such was practically non-existent in the transit zones. Since then, according to the Hungarian Government, education in the Tompa transit zone is organised by the Szeged Educational District and in the Rőszke transit zone it is organised by the Kiskőrös Educational District (the latter being where unaccompanied minors are accommodated). Based on personal

²²⁹ HHC, *Information gathered during interviews conducted during the age, gender and diversity monitoring visits*, September 2012.

meetings with unaccompanied children who had participated in these educational programs the HHC came to the conclusion that this can hardly be perceived as effective education. Unaccompanied minors found them useful mostly because they had a sense of activity rather than dullness for a while during their arbitrary detention. Classes were not tailored or age-appropriate and teachers often lacked the necessary linguistic skills needed to teach effectively. Based on the observation of teaching materials handed out to unaccompanied minors who had been in the transit zone it could be seen that the classes mostly focused on enabling minors to say a few basic things in Hungarian. According to their statements, they were not using textbooks and were seemingly not following a detailed and carefully planned curriculum.

D. Health care

Indicators: Health Care

1. Is access to emergency healthcare for asylum seekers guaranteed in national legislation?
☒ Yes ☐ No
2. Do asylum seekers have adequate access to health care in practice?
☐ Yes ☒ Limited ☐ No
3. Is specialised treatment for victims of torture or traumatised asylum seekers available in practice?
☐ Yes ☒ Limited ☐ No
4. If material conditions are reduced or withdrawn, are asylum seekers still given access to health care?
☒ Yes ☐ Limited ☐ No

Access to health care is provided for asylum seekers as part of material reception conditions.²³⁰ It covers essential medical services and corresponds to free medical services provided to legally residing third-country nationals.²³¹ Asylum seekers have a right to examinations and treatment by general practitioners, but all specialised treatment conducted in polyclinics and hospitals is free only in case of emergency and upon referral by a general practitioner.

According to the Asylum Decree,²³² asylum seekers with special needs are “eligible for free of charge health care services, rehabilitation, psychological and clinical psychological care or psychotherapeutic treatment required by the person’s state of health.”

In practice there are no guidelines for identifying vulnerable asylum seekers and a lack of specialised medical services. Furthermore, only a few experts speak foreign languages and even fewer have experience in dealing with torture or trauma survivors. The Cordelia Foundation, an NGO, is the only organisation with the necessary experience in providing psychological assistance to torture survivors and traumatised asylum seekers in a limited number of the reception centres. Their capacity is limited and every year the question arises whether it will continue to provide these much needed services, as its activities are funded on a project-by-project basis and not under the framework of a regular service provider contracted by the IAO. In 2017 the Cordelia Foundation was present in **Vámosszabadi** on alternate weeks until June, and since then on a weekly basis like in **Kiskunhalas**. Despite the utmost importance of the organisation’s work, it has not been given an entrance permit to the transit zones so far. The therapeutic activities of the Foundation include verbal and non-verbal, individual, family and group therapies, and psychological and social counselling. The Foundation also plays a key role in the lives of asylum seekers who are placed in private accommodation, mainly in **Budapest**.

Asylum seekers have access to a general physician within all reception centres several times per week and to nurses on a daily basis. However, their access to effective medical assistance is hindered by language problems because translators are not always available or provided by IAO, as well as due to capacity problems. Specialised health care is provided in nearby hospitals in all major towns, although similar language problems occur here in cases where a social worker is not available to accompany asylum seekers to the hospital to assist in the communication with doctors.

²³⁰ Section 26 Asylum Act.

²³¹ A detailed list is provided under Section 26 Asylum Decree.

²³² Section 34 Asylum Decree.

Emergency health care services must be provided even in the event of the reduction or withdrawal of reception conditions.²³³

The Asylum Decree states that asylum seekers residing in private accommodation are eligible for health services at the general physician operated by the competent local government and determined by the residency address of the applicant. In practice, these asylum seekers struggle to access medical services as physicians systematically refuse the registration and treatment of asylum seekers on the grounds that they lack a health insurance card. According to information provided by the IAO, asylum seekers can be registered with the number of their humanitarian residency card and have to be treated in accordance with the law, although many health centres are not aware of this information.

E. Special reception needs of vulnerable groups

Indicators: Special Reception Needs

1. Is there an assessment of special reception needs of vulnerable persons in practice?
☒ Yes ☐ No

Section 2(k) of the Asylum Act identifies persons with special needs as including “unaccompanied children or vulnerable persons, in particular, minor, elderly, disabled persons, pregnant women, single parents raising minor children or persons suffering from torture, rape or any other grave form of psychological, physical or sexual violence.”

Furthermore, the Asylum Act provides that in case of persons requiring special treatment, due consideration shall be given to their specific needs.²³⁴ Persons with special needs – if needed with respect to the person’s individual situation and based on the medical specialist’s opinion – shall be eligible to additional free of charge health care services, rehabilitation, psychological and clinical psychological care or psychotherapeutic treatment required by the person’s state of health.²³⁵

It is the duty of the IAO to ascertain whether the rules applying to vulnerable asylum seekers are applicable to the individual circumstances of the asylum seeker. In case of doubt, the IAO can request expert assistance by a doctor or a psychologist.²³⁶ There is no protocol, however, for identifying vulnerable asylum seekers upon reception in a facility and therefore it depends very much on the actual asylum officer whether the special needs of a particular asylum seeker are identified at the beginning or through the procedure (see [Identification](#)).

Before the March 2017 amendments, when there had been overcrowding in reception centres, single women were usually accommodated together with families on one floor. Families were not separated during the asylum procedure.

Unaccompanied asylum-seeking children below the age of 14 are placed in special homes in **Fót**, designated specifically for unaccompanied children, where social and psychological services are available.²³⁷ However, it is the responsibility of the authorities to conduct an age assessment, and often their level of expertise is dubious at best (see section on [Identification](#)). If the assessment results in the person being considered either an adult or a child above fourteen, then this poses an obstacle to accessing the services that a child would need. In 2017, the HHC published its report “Best Interest Out of Sight - The Treatment of Asylum Seeking Children in Hungary”, detailing the problems facing child asylum seekers.²³⁸

²³³ Section 30(3) Asylum Act.

²³⁴ Section 4(3) Asylum Act.

²³⁵ Section 34 Asylum Decree.

²³⁶ Section 3(1)(2) Asylum Decree.

²³⁷ HHC, *Best Interest Out of Sight - The Treatment of Asylum Seeking Children in Hungary*, 17 May 2017, available at: <http://bit.ly/2nMWtrs>.

²³⁸ *Ibid.*

Hungary has no specific reception facility for vulnerable asylum seekers except for unaccompanied children. Single women, female-headed families, and victims of torture and rape, as well as gay, lesbian or transgender asylum seekers are accommodated in the same facilities as others, with no specific attention, while there are no protected corridors or houses. Several single women, as well as transgender asylum seekers had complained to the HHC about regular harassment by other asylum seekers, against which the IAO had not taken the necessary measures. As of 1 January 2018, if the gender identity of the asylum seeker is different from his registered gender, this must be taken into account when providing accommodation at the reception centre.²³⁹

Medical assistance for seriously mentally challenged persons is unresolved. Similarly, residents with drug or other type of addiction have no access to mainstream health care services.

For special reception needs in the transit zones, see [Conditions in Detention Facilities](#).

F. Information for asylum seekers and access to reception centres

1. Provision of information

Asylum seekers are informed of their rights and obligations pursuant to Section 17(3) of the Asylum Decree. After the submission of the asylum application, the IAO shall inform in writing the person seeking asylum in his or her mother tongue or in another language understood by him or her, without delay and within a maximum of 15 days, concerning all provisions and assistance to which he or she is entitled under the law, as well as the obligations with which he or she must comply in respect to reception conditions, and information as to organisations providing legal or other individual assistance.

Information is also provided orally to asylum seekers on the day when they arrive at the reception centre, in addition to an information leaflet. The information given includes the house rules of the reception centre, the material assistance to which applicants are entitled, and information on access to education and health care. The information is communicated both orally and in written form, in a language that the asylum seeker understands. However, written information on reception conditions is only available in Hungarian or in English, which is of little help to a foreigner not speaking any of these two languages.

Before the March 2017 amendments, the provision of information had proven to be a challenge especially in 2015. Most asylum seekers with whom the HHC spoke were lacking even the most basic information relating to the rules of the facility they were staying in and their rights and obligations. Information on the asylum procedure was clearly missing and interpretation into other languages continued to pose problems. Despite the changed reception conditions of 2017, the basic problems regarding the provision of information still persist.

2. Access to reception centres by third parties

Indicators: Access to Reception Centres

1. Do family members, legal advisers, UNHCR and/or NGOs have access to reception centres?

☐ Yes

☒ With limitations

☐ No

Reception centres are open facilities and residents may leave the centre according to the house rules of the facility, and are able to meet anyone outside. Family members do not often come to visit in practice, but they can enter the reception centres provided the asylum seeker living in the centre submits a written request to the authorities. If the family member does not have any available accommodation and there is free space in the reception centre, the management of the centre can provide accommodation to the family member visiting the asylum seeker.

²³⁹

Section 22 Asylum Decree.

There are only specific NGOs who have a regular access to the reception centres without any issues. IAO unilaterally terminated the cooperation agreement (concluded in 1998) with HHC on 2 June 2017. The agreement entitled the HHC to enter reception or detention centres and conduct monitoring visits for asylum seekers, to provide free legal counselling and to request statistical data. The HHC had conducted 21 monitoring visits (and prepared reports on these visits) since January 2015.²⁴⁰ Lacking free access to reception facilities, HHC lawyers and attorneys are able to meet asylum seekers upon their requests. As a result of the termination of the cooperation agreement asylum seekers do not have access to legal assistance on the premises of the reception centres. Asylum seekers may meet the lawyer of HHC in the front of the reception facility.

UNHCR has full access to these facilities and does not need to send any prior notification to the IAO before its visit, but in practice does inform the IAO beforehand as a matter of courtesy.

G. Differential treatment of specific nationalities in reception

There is no difference in treatment with respect to reception based on nationality. All existing reception centres host different nationalities. There is no known policy of putting specific nationalities in certain reception centres.

²⁴⁰ HHC, *National authorities terminated cooperation agreements with the Hungarian Helsinki Committee*, available at: <http://bit.ly/2sMyU7o>.

Detention of Asylum Seekers

A. General

Indicators: General Information on Detention

1. Total number of asylum seekers detained in 2017:	
❖ Asylum detention	391
❖ Transit zones	2,107
2. Number of asylum seekers in detention at the end of 2017:	
❖ Asylum detention	5
❖ Transit zones	473
3. Number of detention centres:	
❖ Asylum detention centres	1
❖ Transit zones	2
4. Total capacity of detention centres:	
❖ Asylum detention centres	105
❖ Transit zones	700

Detention has become a frequent practice rather than an exceptional measure in Hungary. In 2017, only 391 asylum seekers were detained in what is formally described as asylum detention:

Asylum detention of asylum seekers: 2014-2017			
	Asylum applicants detained	Total asylum applicants	Percentage
2014	4,829	42,777	11.28%
2015	2,393	177,135	1.35%
2016	2,621	29,432	8.9%
2017	391	3,397	11.5%

Source: IAO: <http://bit.ly/2knRWuP>.

However, the vast majority of asylum seekers (2,107) were detained in the transit zones. Taken together, the number of applicants detained in transit zones and asylum detention made up 94% of the total number of asylum seekers.

In 2016 it was frequently the case that there were more asylum seekers detained than in open reception centres. On 27 December 2016, the number of asylum seekers in detention exceeded those accommodated in open reception centres, as 273 applicants were detained while only 194 stayed in open reception facilities.²⁴¹ As of 27 December 2016, 8.9% of asylum seekers applying in Hungary were detained. In 2017 most of the asylum seekers were detained, as the new amendments to the Asylum Act that entered into force on 28 March 2017 introduced the mandatory requirement that all asylum seekers stay in the transit zone for the whole duration of the asylum procedure, with the exception of unaccompanied children below the age of 14.

There is only 1 functioning asylum detention facility at the moment: **Nyírbátor**. **Kiskunhalas** and **Békéscsaba** are temporary closed.

There are also 4 immigration detention centres in Budapest Airport Police Directorate, Nyírbátor, Kiskunhalas and Győr, which hold persons waiting to be deported. Asylum seekers who no longer have a right to remain on the territory are also held there.

Since 28 March 2017, all asylum seekers entering the transit zones of Röszke and Tompa are *de facto* detained, although the Hungarian authorities refuse to recognise that this is detention. The fact that asylum seekers inside the transit zones are deprived of their freedom of movement is also confirmed by

²⁴¹ HHC, *Key asylum figures as of 1 January 2017*, available at: <http://bit.ly/2j46z3R>.

the CPT and UNHCR.²⁴² On 14 March 2017, the ECtHR issued a long-awaited judgment in the HHC-represented *Ilias and Ahmed v. Hungary* case. The Court confirmed its established jurisprudence that confinement in the transit zones in Hungary amounted to unlawful detention and established the violation of Article 5(1), a violation of Article 5(4) and a violation of Article 13 in conjunction with Article 3 of the Convention due to the lack of effective remedy to complain about the conditions of detention in the transit zone. The government's appeal against the judgment is currently pending at the Grand Chamber of the ECtHR. In 2017, a total of 2,107 asylum seekers were *de facto* detained in the transit zones.

At present two transit zones are in operation: the **Rösztke** transit zone is suitable for accommodating 450 asylum seekers whereas the **Tompa** transit zone is suitable for accommodating 250 asylum seekers.

B. Legal framework of detention

1. Grounds for detention

Indicators: Grounds for Detention

1. In practice, are most asylum seekers detained

❖ on the territory:	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
❖ at the border:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
2. Are asylum seekers detained in practice during the Dublin procedure?

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Frequently	<input type="checkbox"/> Rarely	<input type="checkbox"/> Never
--	---------------------------------	--------------------------------
3. Are asylum seekers detained during a regular procedure in practice?

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Frequently	<input type="checkbox"/> Rarely	<input type="checkbox"/> Never
--	---------------------------------	--------------------------------

Under Section 31/A(1) of the Asylum Act, the IAO may detain asylum seeker:

- (a) To establish his or her identity or nationality;
 - (b) Where a procedure is ongoing for the expulsion of a person seeking recognition and it can be proven on the basis of objective criteria – inclusive of the fact that the applicant has had the opportunity beforehand to submit application of asylum – or there is a well-founded reason to presume that the person seeking recognition is applying for asylum exclusively to delay or frustrate the performance of the expulsion;
 - (c) In order to establish the required data for conducting the procedure and where these facts or circumstances cannot be established in the absence of detention, in particular when there is a risk of absconding by the applicant;
 - (d) To protect national security or public order;
 - (e) Where the application has been submitted in an airport procedure; or
 - (f) Where it is necessary to carry out a Dublin transfer and there is a serious risk of absconding.
- (1a) In order to carry out the Dublin transfer, the refugee authority may take into asylum detention a foreigner who failed to submit an application for asylum in Hungary and the Dublin handover can take place in his or her case.
- (1b) The rules applicable to applicants in asylum detention shall apply *mutatis mutandis* to a foreigner detained under Subsection (1a) for the duration of the asylum detention. Following the termination of the asylum detention and the frustration of the transfer, the alien policing rules shall apply.

The ground most commonly used is the “risk of absconding” under Section 31/A(1)(c), sometimes in combination with the “identification” ground.²⁴³ The risk of absconding is defined in Section 36/E of the

²⁴² CPT, *Report to the Hungarian Government on the visit to Hungary carried out from 21 to 27 October 2015*, 3 November 2016; UNHCR, *Hungary as a country of asylum*, May 2016.

²⁴³ In February 2014, the HHC staff conducted monitoring visits to the three asylum detention centres open at the time (Békéscsaba, Debrecen, Nyírbátor). The monitoring teams interviewed over 150 detainees and collected the decisions ordering or maintaining the detention. Following these visits, HHC analysed a total of

Asylum Decree as present: if “the third-country national does not cooperate with the authorities during the immigration proceedings, in particular if”:

- (a) He or she refuses to make a statement or sign the documents;
- (b) He or she supplies false information in connection with his or her personal data; or
- (c) Based on his or her statements, it is probable that he or she will depart for an unknown destination, and therefore there are reasonable grounds for presuming that he or she will frustrate the realisation of the purpose of the asylum procedure (including Dublin procedure).

However, the HHC observes that the assessment of whether it is probable that a person will depart for an unknown destination is sometimes done in a very arbitrary way. For example, in 2014 HHC has come across detention orders where it was considered that someone presents a risk of absconding where, when asked by the authorities which was their destination country, they answer that they wanted to come to the EU and do not explicitly mention Hungary.²⁴⁴ The HHC’s attorneys observed the same in 2016: a risk of absconding is established if a person does not explicitly mention Hungary, but states that he or she wanted to reach a safe country. For example in the **Kiskunhalas** asylum detention centre, there was a case where asylum seeker entered Hungary legally through a transit zone and stated that his intention was to apply for asylum in Hungary. Nevertheless he was detained on several grounds, amongst which was also the risk of absconding ground, which lacked any justification.

Moreover, the IAO seems to take a questionable interpretation of the “threat to public safety” ground following the criminalisation of irregular entry into Hungary as of September 2015. According to the authorities in **Békéscsaba** (now closed), due to their prior criminal conviction for irregular entry, asylum seekers are automatically deemed to pose a threat to public safety and are therefore detainable.²⁴⁵ This is a very problematic reading of said detention ground as it reveals a systematic use rather than an individualised assessment of whether an applicant constitutes a genuine and present threat to public order. The CPT was struck by the approach of the Hungarian authorities, which continued the criminal proceedings even if a person applied for asylum after entering illegally.²⁴⁶

According to the Supreme Court (*Kúria*) opinion, contrary to the practice so far, asylum detention should only last, with regard to detention based on Section 31/A (1)(a) and (c) of the Asylum Act, until the adoption of the final decision of the authority. Conversely, in the judicial review phase, during the asylum appeal, asylum detention cannot be ordered or maintained based on these grounds. The fact that a case is in the judicial review phase does not affect the necessity or possible maintenance of detention for the purposes of national security, public safety or order.

According to the HHC, detention of asylum seekers in Hungary often does not comply with the requirements of ECHR. Asylum seekers in detention in Hungary receive a humanitarian permit while they are in detention, which means that they are explicitly authorised to stay in Hungary during the asylum procedure. Since this is the case, their detention cannot fall under the Article 5(1)(f) of the Convention, because their detention does not pursue the two purposes mentioned in this provision, namely detention for the purpose of deportation and detention in order to prevent unauthorised entry. Further on, detention for the purpose of establishing their identity also cannot fall under Article 5(1)(b) of the Convention since, under current legislation in Hungary, there is no obligation for asylum seekers to provide documentary evidence of their identity. Therefore detention for the purpose of establishing their identity is unlawful, when asylum seekers make reasonable efforts to clear their identity. All the above is reflected in the *O.M. v. Hungary* judgment of the ECtHR that became final on 5 October 2016.²⁴⁷ The judgment also finds that detention was not assessed in a sufficiently individualised manner and that in case of the applicant, who belonged to a vulnerable group, the authorities did not exercise particular care in order to avoid situations which may reproduce the plight that forced him to flee.

107 decisions. See HHC, *Information Note on asylum-seekers in detention and in Dublin procedures in Hungary*, May 2014, available at: <http://bit.ly/1MOn00Q>, 7.

²⁴⁴ *Ibid*, 10.

²⁴⁵ ECRE, *Crossing Boundaries*, October 2015, 26-27.

²⁴⁶ CPT, *Report to the Hungarian Government on the visit to Hungary carried out from 21 to 27 October 2015*, 3 November 2016, para 14.

²⁴⁷ ECtHR, *O.M. v. Hungary*, Application No 9912/15, Judgment of 5 October 2016.

Since the entry into force of amendments to the Asylum legislation on 28 March 2017, asylum detention is hardly ever used. At the moment of this update, only 5 people are detained in the asylum detention. The amended law provides that it is only possible to apply for asylum in the transit zones and that all asylum seekers, with the exception of unaccompanied minors below age of 14, have to remain in the transit zone for the whole duration of the asylum procedure. The stay in the transit zone is *de facto* detention.

Asylum seekers under a Dublin procedure, with the exception of unaccompanied minors below 14 years of age are always detained for the whole duration of the Dublin procedure in the *de facto* detention in the transit zone.

2. Alternatives to detention

Indicators: Alternatives to Detention

1. Which alternatives to detention have been laid down in the law?

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Reporting duties
<input type="checkbox"/> Surrendering documents
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Financial guarantee
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Residence restrictions
<input type="checkbox"/> Other
2. Are alternatives to detention used in practice?

<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
------------------------------	--

Alternatives to detention, called “measures ensuring availability”, are available in the form of:

- (a) Bail;²⁴⁸
- (b) Designated place of stay;²⁴⁹ and
- (c) Periodic reporting obligations.²⁵⁰

Asylum detention may only be ordered on the basis of assessment of the individual’s circumstances and only if its purpose cannot be achieved by applying less coercive alternatives to detention. However, the HHC’s experience shows that the detention orders lack individual assessments and alternatives are not properly and automatically examined. Decisions ordering and upholding asylum detention are schematic, lack individualised reasoning with regard to the lawfulness and proportionality of detention, and fail to consider the individual circumstances (including vulnerabilities) of the person concerned. The necessity and proportionality tests are not used. The orders only state that alternatives are not possible in a concrete case, but there is no explanation as to why.²⁵¹ According to the Supreme Court (Kúria) opinion, contrary to the current practice, alternatives must be considered not only in the course of the initial one, but also in subsequent decisions on extension.

The *O.M. v. Hungary* case of 5 October 2016 also established that the detention order of a vulnerable asylum seeker was not sufficiently individualised.

UNHCR has observed that the assessment of applicability of alternatives to detention is largely restricted in practice to the applicability of asylum bail, while the other two alternative measures such as the regular reporting requirement and the designated place of accommodation are rarely or not applied as standalone measures.²⁵²

The scope of application of the bail as an alternative to detention is not sufficiently defined and may lead to the non-application of this measure in practice. The amount of the bail can vary between €500 and

²⁴⁸ Sections 2(lc) 31/H Asylum Act.

²⁴⁹ Section 2(lb) Asylum Act.

²⁵⁰ Section 2(la) Asylum Act.

²⁵¹ HHC, *Information Note on asylum-seekers in detention and in Dublin procedures in Hungary*, May 2014, 6-7.

²⁵² UNHCR, *UNHCR comments and recommendations on the draft modification of certain migration, asylum-related and other legal acts for the purpose of legal harmonisation*, January 2015, available at: <http://bit.ly/1HZH0tt>.

5,000, but the conditions of assessment are not properly defined by law, thereby casting doubts on its transparent and coherent application. According to the law, the amount of bail should depend on the personal conditions and situation of the applicants as determined by the authority. Unfortunately, in practice there is no individualised approach used in determining the amount of bail. The average amount of bail ordered so far was €1,000. The application of bail remains very rare in practice. The HHC's attorneys reported that the IAO does not examine the possibility of applying bail automatically, which is not in line with the recast Reception Conditions Directive. Bail is examined only if the asylum seeker asks for it and is rejected in most of the cases. If the asylum seeker or his or her representative makes the request for bail at the court in **Békéscsaba**, the court would reject such a request, stating that this decision has to be taken by the IAO. The HHC's attorney has witnessed cases where the IAO wrote in the detention order that the asylum seeker did not have any money for the bail, despite the fact that the possession of money was written on the document which officially records the belongings of asylum seekers. The IAO does not transmit this document to the court. When this fact was raised by the attorney at the court, the court again said that this should be decided by the IAO and that the court does not have any competence in this.

Alternatives were applied as follows in 2016 and 2017:

Asylum detention and alternatives to detention: 2016-2017		
Type of measure	2016	2017
Alternatives to detention	54,898	1,176
Bail	283	2
Designated place of stay	54,615	1,176
Asylum detention	2,621	391

Source: IAO.

In 2017, asylum detention was hardly used, along with the alternatives to detention. Most asylum seekers (2,107) were *de facto* detained in the transit zones, for which no alternative is prescribed in the law.

“House arrest” following criminal proceedings

On 15 September 2015, the Government introduced an amendment to the Act on Criminal Proceedings in order to allow for the “house arrest” of third country nationals, including asylum seekers, in reception and asylum/immigration detention centre in the event that criminal proceedings have been initiated in connection with border fence offences.²⁵³ If a third-country national or asylum seeker has crossed the border fence in an unauthorised manner, or if he or she has destroyed the border fence or in any way hindered the building or erecting of the fence, and criminal proceedings have been instituted against him or her, the person may be kept under house arrest in the asylum/immigration detention centre or other facility where he or she is accommodated, during the period where a crisis situation caused by mass immigration prevails.

UNHCR believes that holding asylum seekers in closed detention centres is at odds with the ordinary purpose of “house arrest”. Since the specific, more favourable conditions that are otherwise applicable in the context of house arrest,²⁵⁴ such as greater freedom of movement and more flexible

²⁵³ Chapter XXVI/A relevant to crimes related to the border fence (introduced by Act CXL of 2015 As of 15 September 2015). Section 542/H provides that “[i]n case of criminal procedures initiated because of crimes stipulated in Section 542/D (i.e. unauthorized crossing of the border fence [Criminal Code Section 352/A], destroying the border fence [Criminal Code Section 352/B] and the hindering the building/erecting of the border fence [Criminal Code Section 352/C], during a crisis situation caused by mass immigration, as a matter of priority, house arrest shall be ordered, in order to respect the interests of minors, and it shall be implemented in facilities providing reception conditions and detention covered by the Asylum Act and the Aliens Act.” [Unofficial translation].

²⁵⁴ See Section 138 of Act XIX of 1998 on Criminal Proceedings.

communication with the outside world, cannot be ensured in detention, in UNHCR's assessment, house arrest implemented in an immigration or asylum detention facility for immigration-related purposes essentially amounts to detention. As such, it would not appear to constitute a less coercive alternative to detention, which Member States are required to apply under Article 8(2) of the Reception Conditions Directive, before resorting to detention.²⁵⁵ UNHCR is particularly concerned about the regime applied to families under house arrest in asylum/immigration detention facilities, as the principle of family unity is not upheld in all cases. Sometimes, family members of individuals under house arrest are detained in different locations. Children are sometimes separated from their parents and placed in a children's home. This situation is clearly at odds with the requirement contained in the amendment itself, which provides that house arrest in asylum/immigration detention centres is made possible to respect the interest of children.²⁵⁶

The HHC is not aware of any cases of house arrest in 2017.

3. Detention of vulnerable applicants

Indicators: Detention of Vulnerable Applicants

1. Are unaccompanied asylum-seeking children detained in practice?

☒ Frequently
 ☐ Rarely
 ☐ Never

❖ If frequently or rarely, are they only detained in border/transit zones? ☒ Yes ☐ No
2. Are asylum seeking children in families detained in practice?

☒ Frequently
 ☐ Rarely
 ☐ Never

3.1. Vulnerable applicants in asylum detention

Unaccompanied children are explicitly excluded from asylum and immigration detention by law.²⁵⁷ While asylum detention was still widely used, despite that clear ban, unaccompanied children had been detained due to incorrect age assessment,²⁵⁸ as the age assessment methods employed by the police and IAO are considerably problematic (see section on [Identification](#) above). For example, CPT found during its visit one unaccompanied minor who was detained for 4 days.²⁵⁹

In late October 2015, Human Rights Watch interviewed nine youth in the **Békéscsaba** and **Nyírbátor** asylum detention facilities who said they were between 14 and 17 years old and whose appearance strongly suggested that they were under 18. All nine said that they had told staff they were unaccompanied children, but staff failed to take the steps necessary to properly assess their ages. Directors at both asylum detention centres denied that any unaccompanied children were detained there. In its 17 November 2015 response to Human Rights Watch, the IAO said that no unaccompanied children were currently detained in asylum detention in Hungary, and that if there is any doubt about the age of an asylum seeker, authorities send the person for a medical examination to establish their age. However, the age-disputed children Human Rights Watch interviewed either had not been seen by a medical professional at all or had received a cursory examination consisting of questions. Some said medical staff only looked at them, and in one case a staff member asked a detainee to remove his T-shirt.²⁶⁰

²⁵⁵ UNHCR, *Hungary as a country of asylum*, May 2016, 24.

²⁵⁶ See Section 542/H of Act XIX of 1998 on Criminal Proceedings.

²⁵⁷ Section 56 TCN Act; Section 31/B(2) Asylum Act.

²⁵⁸ HHC, *Information Note on asylum-seekers in detention and in Dublin procedures in Hungary*, May 2014, 12.

²⁵⁹ CPT, *Report to the Hungarian Government on the visit to Hungary carried out from 21 to 27 October 2015*, 3 November 2016, para 60.

²⁶⁰ Human Rights Watch, 'Hungary: Locked Up for Seeking Asylum', 1 December 2015, available at: <https://goo.gl/zcc8li>.

From 28 March 2017, all unaccompanied children above age of 14 are *de facto* detained in the transit zones for the whole duration of asylum procedure. According to the statistics of IAO there were 91 unaccompanied children detained in the transit zones in 2017.²⁶¹

Moreover, no other categories of vulnerable asylum seekers are excluded from detention. Whereas previously families with children were not detained in practice, they are again detained in some cases. The detention of families has been criticised as discriminating between children based on their family status contrary to Article 2(2) of the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child, according to the Hungarian Parliamentary Commissioner for Fundamental Rights.²⁶²

However, asylum detention must be terminated if the asylum seeker requires extended hospitalisation for health reasons.²⁶³

In 2016, there were 54 families detained for an average time of 24 days.²⁶⁴ There were 36 families including children kept in asylum detention for an average time of 22 days. According to the statistics of IAO, in 2017, 24 children with their families were kept in detention for an average time of 22 days.²⁶⁵

From 28 March 2017, all asylum-seeking families were *de facto* detained in the transit zones.

3.2. Vulnerable applicants in transit zones

On 7 March 2017, UNHCR expressed their deep concerns over the conditions in the transit zone that will have grave effects on children: "This new law violates Hungary's obligations under international and EU laws, and will have a terrible physical and psychological impact on women, children and men who have already greatly suffered."²⁶⁶ On 8 March 2017, the Commissioner of Human Rights of the Council of Europe also gave alarming signals after the adoption of the amendments to the Asylum Act: "As reported, the adopted Bill would allow the automatic detention of all asylum seekers, including families with children and unaccompanied minors from the age of 14, in shipping containers surrounded by high razor wire fence at the border for extended periods of time. Under the case law of the European Court of Human Rights, detention for the purpose of denying entry to a territory or for removal must be a measure of last resort, only if less coercive alternatives cannot be applied, and based on the facts and circumstances of the individual case. Automatically depriving all asylum seekers of their liberty would be in clear violation of Hungary's obligations under the European Convention on Human Rights".²⁶⁷

In early May 2017, a high-level delegation consisting of three members of the European Parliament's Civil Liberties, Justice and Home Affairs Committee visited the transit zones. Members of the delegation (the Vice-President of the Group of the Progressive Alliance of the Socialists and Democrats (S&D Group) Josef Weidenholzer, Bureau member Peter Niedermüller and S&D Spokesperson for Civil Liberties, Justice and Home Affairs Birgit Sippel) declared in their joint statement that "The conditions asylum seekers are facing in Hungary are grim. Within the Röszke Transition Zone on the Hungarian-Serbian border, women, children and whole families are locked in narrow spaces and require a police escort to even visit a doctor. The conditions are not only inhumane but may also be in breach of international and European law. We remain convinced that only a common European asylum policy can help improve the situation refugees are facing and ensure order at the EU's external borders." On 17 May 2017, the European Commission announced that it will move forward with the infringement procedure against Hungary concerning its asylum law. Amongst other issues, the Commission believes that the systematic and indefinite confinement of asylum seekers in closed facilities in the transit zone

²⁶¹ Information provided by IAO, 12 February 2018.

²⁶² Commissioner for Fundamental Rights, *Report in Case No. AJB 4019/2012*, June 2012, available at: <http://bit.ly/1JKiBZN>.

²⁶³ Section 31/A(8)(d) Asylum Act.

²⁶⁴ Information provided by the IAO, 20 January, 2017.

²⁶⁵ Information provided by IAO, 12 February 2018.

²⁶⁶ UNHCR, 'UNHCR deeply concerned by Hungary plans to detain all asylum seekers', 7 March 2017, available at: <http://bit.ly/2sGzPpR>.

²⁶⁷ Council of Europe Commissioner for Human Rights, 'Commissioner concerned about Hungary's new law allowing automatic detention of asylum seekers', 8 March 2017, available at: <http://bit.ly/2HzHObY>.

without respecting required procedural safeguards, such as the right to appeal, leads to systematic detentions, which are in breach of the EU law on reception conditions and the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the EU. The Hungarian law fails to provide the required material reception conditions for asylum applicants, thus violating the EU rules in this respect.²⁶⁸ On 7 December 2017 the European Commission decided to move forward on the infringement procedure by sending a reasoned opinion.²⁶⁹ On 12 September 2017 UN High Commissioner for Refugees Filippo Grandi called on Hungary to “do away with its so-called border transit zones”, which he said are “in effect detention centres.” The High Commissioner “expressed his concern that asylum-seekers, including children, were being kept in the transit zones” during their asylum process. “Children, in particular, should not be confined in detention”, Grandi said Tuesday after touring the Röszke transit zone...²⁷⁰ On 13 October 2017 the Council of Europe Special Representative on migration and refugees published a report on his fact finding mission (12-16 June 2017) to the transit zones. He recorded that the metal containers accommodating asylum seekers “were directly exposed to the atmospheric conditions in both hot and cold weather; at the time of our visit there were several complaints by asylum-seekers about unbearable heat inside the containers.” The Special Representative also accounts for a lack of “educational programmes, language learning programmes or curricula adapted to the particular needs and age of children in either transit zone and children cannot attend local schools.” The Special Representative further reported on children complaining about the inadequacy of food provided for them.²⁷¹ Lanzarote Committee published an extensive report Special report further to a visit undertaken by its delegation to transit zones at the Serbian/Hungarian border (5-7 July 2017).²⁷²

The HHC successfully halted the deportation from open centres to the transit zones – and thus to arbitrary detention – of 9 vulnerable asylum-seekers (8 unaccompanied children and one pregnant woman) by obtaining 2 interim measures from the ECtHR just before the March 2017 amendments entered into force.²⁷³ The HHC obtained 7 other ECtHR interim measures concerning 6 families with small children and one unaccompanied child from Afghanistan who were all detained in the transit zones. The ECtHR requested the Hungarian government to immediately place the applicants in conditions that are in compliance with the prohibition of torture and inhuman or degrading treatment. The Hungarian government only released the applicants when they obtained a form of protection, therefore it can be concluded that the interim measures were not respected.²⁷⁴

²⁶⁸ European Commission, ‘Commission follows up on infringement procedure against Hungary concerning its asylum law’, IP/17/1285, 17 May 2017, available at: <http://bit.ly/2qvYAA0>.

²⁶⁹ European Commission, ‘Migration: Commission steps up infringement against Hungary concerning its asylum law’, IP/17/5023, 7 December 2017, available at: <http://bit.ly/2sJ4Vgu>.

²⁷⁰ UNHCR, ‘UNHCR Chief visits Hungary, calls for greater access to asylum, end to detention and more solidarity with refugees’, 12 September 2017, available at: <http://bit.ly/2y2BnsC>.

²⁷¹ Council of Europe, *Report of the fact-finding mission by Ambassador Tomáš Boček, Special Representative of the Secretary General on migration and refugees to Serbia and two transit zones in Hungary 12-16 June 2017*, SG/Inf(2017)33, 13 October 2017, available at: <http://bit.ly/2DS9v14>.

²⁷² Council of Europe Lanzarote Committee, *Special report further to a visit to transit zones at the Serbian/Hungarian border*, T-ES(2017)11, 30 January 2018, available at <http://bit.ly/2C6bYyZ>.

²⁷³ HHC, *Government’s new asylum bill on collective push-backs and automatic detention*, 15 February 2017, available at: <http://bit.ly/2FhFYLG>.

²⁷⁴ HHC, *Interim measures granted in cases against Hungary until May 2017*, 31 May 2017, available at: <http://bit.ly/2of8QNi>.

4. Duration of detention

Indicators: Duration of Detention

- | | |
|--|---------------|
| 1. What is the maximum detention period set in the law (incl. extensions): | 6 months |
| ❖ Asylum detention | 6 months |
| ❖ Transit zones | None |
| 2. In practice, how long in average are asylum seekers detained? | |
| ❖ Asylum detention | 59 days |
| ❖ Transit zones | Not available |

The maximum period of asylum detention is 6 months, and 12 months for subsequent applicants whose cases have no suspensive effect. Families with children under 18 years of age may not be detained for more than 30 days. *De facto* detention in the transit zones has no maximum time limit.

In 2014 and 2015 detained asylum seekers were likely to spend the whole status determination procedure at first instance in detention.²⁷⁵ Once the IAO adopted a decision on their case, asylum seekers were released, even in the case that the decision was negative.

After 15 September 2015, however, the detention of asylum seekers was implicitly allowed during the court review procedure, which is clearly not in line with the provisions of Article 8 of the recast Reception Conditions Directive. Section 68(4) of the Asylum Act foresees that the court hearing is only obligatory in case the applicant is in asylum detention which indicates that the legislator sees detention possible throughout the entire asylum procedure including the judicial review phase. This contradicts an earlier provision on asylum detention stipulating that the aim of the detention is to gather information so the asylum authority would be able to make a decision.²⁷⁶

Practice on this issue varied in 2016, as asylum seekers were sometimes released even before the IAO would adopt a decision, in other cases they would be kept until they would receive the IAO decision, and in other cases for the maximum period of time. This clearly shows on arbitrariness of the system, where no clear policy could be established. Sometimes the release would depend on nationality, if asylum seekers who received negative IAO's decision were from a country into which deportation are possible, they would not be released, while if they were from the country where deportations are harder (e.g. Afghans) they would be released before.

In 2017, the average period of asylum detention was 59 days. Families with children were placed in asylum detention for an average of 22 days.

As of March 2017, asylum seekers who are *de facto* detained in the transit zone remain there until the end of their asylum procedure. Unaccompanied children were held there for an average of 47 days.

C. Detention conditions

1. Place of detention

Indicators: Place of Detention

- | | | |
|--|------------------------------|--|
| 1. Does the law allow for asylum seekers to be detained in prisons for the purpose of the asylum procedure (i.e. not as a result of criminal charges)? | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No |
| 2. If so, are asylum seekers ever detained in practice in prisons for the purpose of the asylum procedure? | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No |

²⁷⁵ HHC, *Information Note on asylum-seekers in detention and in Dublin procedures in Hungary*, May 2014, 4.
²⁷⁶ Section 31/A(1)(c) Asylum Act.

Since 2013, asylum seekers have been detained in asylum detention facilities.²⁷⁷ In 2017 only a small number remained detained in asylum detention facilities. Asylum detention used to be implemented in three places: Kiskunhalas, Nyírbátor and Békéscsaba. At the time of writing, the only functioning asylum detention facility is **Nyírbátor**, with a capacity of 105 places.

In 2017, most asylum seekers were *de facto* detained in the transit zones. The two transit zones in **Röszke** and **Tompa** can accommodate 450 and 205 persons respectively. In 2017, total number of asylum seekers detained in Röszke transit zone was 1,252, while it was 855 in Tompa transit zone.²⁷⁸

2. Conditions in detention facilities

Indicators: Conditions in Detention Facilities

- | | | |
|---|---|--|
| 1. Do detainees have access to health care in practice? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No |
| ❖ If yes, is it limited to emergency health care? | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No |

2.1. Living conditions and physical security

Asylum detention

Detained asylum seekers have the right to unsupervised contact with their relatives, to send and receive correspondence, to practice religion and to spend at least one hour per day outdoors.²⁷⁹ The Asylum Decree also specifies minimum requirements for such facilities, including material conditions such as freedom of movement, access to open air, as well as access to recreational facilities, internet and phones, and a 24-hour availability of social workers. According to the Decree, there should be at least 15m³ of air space and 5m² of floor space per person in the living quarters of asylum seekers, while for married couples and families with minor children there should be a separate living space of at least 8m², taking the number of family members into account.²⁸⁰ In practice, asylum seekers' time outdoors is not restricted during the day. They are able to make telephone calls every day, but only if they can afford to purchase a phone card, as their mobile phones are taken away by the authorities on arrival.

Currently only very few asylum seekers are detained in the asylum detention, therefore there are no problems with overcrowding.

Men must be detained separately from women, with the exception of spouses, and families with children are also to be separated from other detainees.²⁸¹

In late 2015, Human Rights Watch found conditions in **Nyírbátor** to be poor. The detainees said the facilities were infested with bedbugs, and Human Rights Watch researchers observed rashes and bites on detainees. Staff said that eradicating the problem would be too costly. Though the temperature was cold, around 5 degrees, many people were without sweaters and were wrapped in bedsheets. Staff said detainees are expected to buy their own clothes.²⁸²

Religious diet is always respected. Specific diets are taken into account, however the HHC is aware of a case, where the detainee despite the medical staff being aware of his medical conditions managed to get a special diet only after he refused to eat the regular food for several days. The nutritional value of the food is regulated in the legal act.

²⁷⁷ Section 31/F(1) Asylum Act and Sections 36/A-36/F Asylum Decree.

²⁷⁸ Information provided by IAO, 12 February 2018.

²⁷⁹ Section 31/F(2) Asylum Act.

²⁸⁰ Section 36/D Asylum Decree.

²⁸¹ Section 31/F(2) Asylum Act.

²⁸² Human Rights Watch, 'Hungary: Locked Up for Seeking Asylum', 1 December 2015, available at: <https://goo.gl/zcc8li>.

Asylum detention facilities are managed by the IAO. Security in the centres is provided by trained police officers. However, there are complaints of aggressive behaviour of the security guards in all the centres. The CPT in its latest report on its visit to Hungary writes:

“A considerable number of foreign nationals claimed that they had been subjected to physical ill treatment by police officers at the moment of apprehension, during transfer to a police establishment and/or during subsequent police questioning. It is of particular concern that some of these allegations were made by foreign nationals who claimed to be unaccompanied minors. In addition, a few allegations were received of physical ill-treatment by police officers and/or armed guards working in immigration or asylum detention facilities.”²⁸³

Regarding records of ill-treatment, the CPT finds that “the records of medical consultations were often rather cursory, lacking details, in particular when it came to the recording of injuries. Moreover, it remained somewhat unclear to the delegation to what extent allegations of ill-treatment and related injuries were reported to the management and relevant authorities.”²⁸⁴

In Nyírbátor, when escorted from the facility to court for hearings, or on other outings (such as to visit a hospital, bank or post office), detained asylum seekers are handcuffed and escorted on leashes, which are normally used for the accused in criminal proceedings.

Asylum seekers can access open-air freely, during the day (contrary to the immigration jails, where open-air access is guaranteed only one hour per day). Open-air space is of adequate size. Each centre also has a fitness room.

The Nyírbátor the open-air space is problematic. The yard is covered with sand, which makes it difficult to practice certain sports (e.g. basketball), and in rainy or cold weather it makes it almost impossible to pursue the sports activities. The detainees complained that the sand makes them very dirty and destroys their shoes. In addition, there are still no benches or trees to assure the shade or protection from the sunlight and rain.

Detainees have access to internet, one hour per day, although this right is hindered in Nyírbátor where they only have a few old computers that work very slowly. In Nyírbátor the detention centre has a small library. Mobile phones are not allowed, but there is access to public phones inside the centre.

Transit zones

The transit zones of **Röszke** and **Tompa** are in remote locations, made out of containers built into the border fence. There are different sectors: offices, a sector for families, a sector for unaccompanied minors, a sector for single men and a sector for single women. Containers are about 13 sq. meters in size (approximately 4 x 3 meters). Asylum-seekers stay in containers furnished with 5 beds. Each asylum-seeker has a bed and a closable wardrobe. When five people are staying in a room, there is no moving space left. In case a family consists of more than 5 members, family members are accommodated in several accommodation units but without being placed together with non-family member persons.

Besides sleeping containers, there is a dining container, a community container, shower containers and an Ecumenical prayer room.

The containers are placed in a square and in the middle there is a courtyard with a playground for children and a ping-pong table. The entire transit zone is surrounded by a razor-wire fence, and is patrolled by police officers and armed security guards. There are cameras in every corner; there is no privacy or silence.

²⁸³ CPT, *Report to the Hungarian Government on the visit to Hungary carried out from 21 to 27 October 2015*, 3 November 2016, para 16.

²⁸⁴ *Ibid*, para 48.

Until September 2017, there were no proper educational activities organised for children. Only a programme aimed at very small children, organised by the social workers, was happening once or twice a week for few hours. There were no activities organized for teenagers or adults, therefore they had no opportunity to spend their time in a meaningful way.

According to the Government, school started in the community rooms of the sectors on 4 September 2017. In the Tompa institute teachers are provided by the Kiskőrös Educational District, whereas in the Röske institute teachers are provided by the Szeged Educational District. For children between the age of 6 and 16 years, school attendance is obligatory (see section on Education under Reception conditions regarding the quality of this education).

Meals are provided three times a day for adults and five times a day for children under fourteen. Catering is provided by the Szeged Strict- and Medium-Regime Prison. The food provided in a day must contain at least 10900 Kjoules of energy.

Asylum-seekers can buy certain items via the social workers. A “shopping list” has been compiled from which asylum-seekers can choose items to buy. Asylum seekers select the items from the list, hand over the money, and when the items have been bought, the social workers settle the accounts in writing.

Each sector has a TV. In the transit zones free WiFi is available and asylum-seekers may keep their mobile phones with them, but no public phones or computers are available. The asylum seekers complain of very poor WiFi connection, which only enables them to send messages, not participate in calls. Those with no personal mobile phone remain disconnected from the outside world.

Summer 2017 was extremely hot (over 30 degrees during the day) and at that time there were no ventilators provided in the containers.²⁸⁵ People also could not leave the windows or doors of the containers opened because bugs would come in, and they complained of their bites. There was hardly any shading roof at the courtyard; therefore people were obliged to stand in direct sunshine if they wanted to be outside during the day. As of August 2017, each room has a ventilator and there are some shades and parasols available. The court yard is covered with white gravel and when it rains, the entire outside area in the transit zone becomes so flooded that it is not possible to use the open-air part.

Asylum seekers are escorted by several police officers anytime they want to go to the medical container, to the interview, or to meet their lawyer. There were reports of people being handcuffed while being taken outside the transit zones to hospitals or to Western Union.

Different sources contain information on the conditions in the transit zones.²⁸⁶

2.2. Access to health care in detention

Asylum detention

Asylum seekers are entitled only to basic medical care. Paramedical nurses are present in the centre all the time and general practitioners regularly visit the facilities. However, medical care provided is often criticised by detainees. They rarely have access to specialist medical care when requested and are only

²⁸⁵ Reuters, ‘Hungary’s tough asylum policy keeps thousands stranded in Serbia’, 14 June 2017, available at <http://reut.rs/2FXatps>.

²⁸⁶ See e.g. Budapest Beacon, ‘Hungary’s transit zones are prisons where pregnant women are handcuffed and children go hungry’, 14 June 2017, available at: <http://bit.ly/2HApcln>; Honvedelem, ‘Belügyminiszteri látogatás a tranzit zónában’, 6 April 2017, available in Hungarian at: <http://bit.ly/2CzOL8Z>; Atlaszo, ‘Life in the Hungarian transit zones: no proper food, medical care or education’, 30 August 2017, available at: <http://bit.ly/2sGBhsj>; András Lederer, ‘Transit zone – summer 2017’, available at: <http://bit.ly/2HAaYYa>; S&D, ‘Conditions refugees are facing in Hungary are appalling – the Commission must act’, 9 May 2017, available at: <http://bit.ly/2pjrpTe>.

taken to hospital in emergency cases. In severe cases of self-harm, detainees are taken to the local psychiatric ward. In the absence of interpretation services available, the patient is usually released after a short stay and some medical treatment provided. Such emergency interventions, however, do not contribute to detainees' overall mental wellbeing and sometimes even fuel further tensions between them. Those, however, whose condition is not deemed to fall under the scope of emergency treatment, are not eligible to see a dentist, cardiologist or psychiatrist. No systematic, specialised and state-funded medical care and monitoring is ensured for victims of torture or other forms of violence in asylum or immigration detention.²⁸⁷ The detainees complain about receiving the same medication for a range of different medical problems (e.g. sleeping pills, aspirin). The language barrier is also an issue. There is no psycho-social support available in any of the detention centres. During consultation hours interpretation is not provided in **Nyírbátor**. The CPT found in 2015 that the provision of psychological and psychiatric care was clearly insufficient, if not inexistent in all establishments visited.²⁸⁸ In the absence of regular, state-funded psychological counselling and regular mental healthcare, the tension deriving from the closed circumstances, lack of information and forced close contact of persons from different national, cultural and social backgrounds is not mitigated. Instances of self-harm, suicidal attempts or thoughts, as well as aggressive outbursts towards fellow detainees or guards were witnessed as regular during all monitoring visits.²⁸⁹

Cordelia Foundation observes that crucial – even life-saving – medical information can be lost as interpretation is not provided in moments such as the first medical check-up in detention centres. For example, the medication of a middle-aged, diabetic Syrian man, together with his personal belongings, was taken away from him upon arrival at the **Békéscsaba** asylum detention centre (now closed). At 03:00, during the initial medical check-up, aimed at ending the 24-hour quarantine of the man and his family, neither the doctor nor the nurses noticed that his blood sugar level was on 24,5 – at least 3 times more than the officially accepted average for diabetics. When accompanied by the monitors of the Cordelia Foundation to the nurse again, his blood sugar was measured and he was given his medication. The medical staff in charge and the camp management justified the incident as the result of a miscommunication between the detainee and the doctor, as no Arabic interpretation was provided during the check-up.²⁹⁰

Moreover, the majority of the social workers working in the asylum detention facilities hardly speak any foreign language and at the time of the HHC's visits the HHC's observed they did not really engage with the detainees. They were mainly performing the administrative tasks, handed out sanitary packs, clothes or other utensils while being mostly separated from their clients by iron doors or having their offices in a part of the centre where detainees have no access to. Social workers could play an active role in the identification of torture victims and other detainees with special needs. However, not only are they overburdened by administrative and basic service provision tasks, but they also lack possibilities to be trained specifically to this end, and they are not officially appointed to perform this task.²⁹¹

Transit zones

Each transit zone has a medical unit capable of accommodating 10 persons. A general practitioner is available for 4 hours on workdays, whereas a children's doctor is available twice a week; in addition, a field surgeon is available in the transit zone every day, 24 hours a day. Where specialist care is needed, the person in need of such care is taken to the specialised medical institution, namely to one of the Medical Clinics of Szeged University or to Kiskunhalas Hospital and Polyclinic.

²⁸⁷ Cordelia Foundation *et al.*, *From Torture to Detention: Access of Torture Survivor and Traumatized Asylum-Seekers to Rights and Care in Detention, Hungary and Bulgaria*, January 2016, available at: <https://goo.gl/iDSni4>.

²⁸⁸ CPT, *Report to the Hungarian Government on the visit to Hungary carried out from 21 to 27 October 2015*, 3 November 2016, para 50.

²⁸⁹ Cordelia Foundation *et al.*, *From Torture to Detention*, January 2016, 24-25.

²⁹⁰ *Ibid*, 23.

²⁹¹ *Ibid*, 25.

When pregnant women have to be taken for a medical examination, 2 or 3 policemen escort them to a nearby hospital. A pregnant woman reported that the policemen had stayed in the examining room during her pre-natal medical check-up. No interpretation is provided during the medical examination, which makes communication and building confidence between doctor and patient extremely difficult. In one of the pending ECtHR cases,²⁹² the Court's interim measure granted explicitly requested the Hungarian government to provide interpretation at the medical check-ups of the applicant. Despite this interim measure being granted, the Hungarian government responded that according to the regulation they are only obliged to guarantee the translation during the administrative procedures and not during the medical examinations.

Asylum seekers complain that they only receive painkillers for any type of problem they report. When being brought outside of the transit zone for medical check-up, asylum seekers are transported in a van fit for the transportation of criminals.

Since mid-November 2017, the IAO employs a clinical psychologist who speaks English and when an asylum seeker does not, a psychologist can request a translator. The psychologist visits both zones once a week.

2.3. Conditions for vulnerable asylum seekers

Asylum detention

Under Section 31/F of the Asylum Act, detention must take into account special needs.²⁹³

Vulnerable persons, except unaccompanied children, are not excluded from detention. HHC regularly sees that persons with special needs such as the elderly, persons with mental or physical disability are detained and do not get adequate support. A mechanism to identify persons with special needs does not exist. The lack of a systematic identification mechanism leads to the frequent detention of torture victims and other traumatised asylum seekers, as well as making existing legal safeguards ineffective. There are no special conditions for vulnerable asylum seekers in detention.

There is no systematic training for those who order, uphold or carry out the detention of asylum-seekers regarding the needs of victims of torture, rape or other serious acts of violence. It is therefore questionable to what extent the authority is capable to carry out the assessment of vulnerabilities and special needs in the framework of detention, given that no expert psychologists and doctors are employed to this end. The IAO may decide to use the assistance of external medical or psychological specialists. However, this is not a common or frequent practice.²⁹⁴

In late 2015, Human Rights Watch found five cases in both immigration and asylum detention where people with psychosocial or physical disabilities and a pregnant woman had been detained. There had not been adequate efforts to move them to a facility suitable to address their special needs.²⁹⁵ For example, Jihad, 23, from Iraq, detained in **Nyirbátor** asylum detention facility for two weeks, showed Human Rights Watch scars on his arms and chest, saying they were from self-inflicted cutting resulting from mental distress: "I tried to commit suicide two days ago [by trying to swallow a lightbulb]. The doctor just gave me a sleeping pill." The director at the centre told Human Rights Watch that Jihad had been taken to a general hospital when he attempted to swallow the lightbulb but had been given no psychiatric or psychological care.

Cordelia Foundation found a young Syrian man in September 2015 in **Békéscsaba** (now closed) who was missing the lower half of one of his legs. As the Békéscsaba asylum detention centre, similarly to other detention facilities, is not equipped to accommodate persons with physical disabilities, the man

²⁹² ECtHR, *R.R. v. Hungary*, Application No 36037/17.

²⁹³ Section 31/F(1) Asylum Act.

²⁹⁴ Cordelia Foundation *et al.*, *From Torture to Detention*, January 2016.

²⁹⁵ Human Rights Watch, 'Hungary: Locked Up for Seeking Asylum', 1 December 2015, available at: <https://goo.gl/zcc8li>.

had to climb a floor in order to reach his room. Even in case of such a grave disability, the IAO considered that detention was appropriate. The detention centre staff, in agreement with the decision, told the monitoring team that the asylum seeker “had no problems coming all the way from Syria with only one leg”.²⁹⁶

Cordelia Foundation monitoring teams have witnessed that needs, even if urgent, of detainees suffering from PTSD or mental disorders not characterised by loud outbursts or aggression, often go unnoticed. In November 2015, the Cordelia Foundation’s psychiatrist identified a patient in one of the detention centres in the acute phase of paranoid psychosis, already detained for several weeks at the time of the visit, whose hallucinations and severe persecution delusions went completely unnoticed until then. As a result of the monitor’s intervention, hospitalisation and medical assistance was initiated.²⁹⁷

Transit zones

The transit zones in their current state are unfit for accommodating people for a longer period of time and are unfit for accommodating people belonging to vulnerable groups for even a shorter period of time. The conditions in the transit zones are dire and clearly do not meet international and EU law standards. Adequate care for vulnerable individuals is missing, similarly to systematic identification and support mechanisms for people with special needs.

The Hungarian Helsinki Committee has already submitted seven requests for interim measures under Rule 39 of the Rules of Court of the European Court of Human Rights in order to obtain the release of vulnerable asylum seekers from the transit zones (6 families and one unaccompanied minor). All six interim measures were granted by the Court, and the Court requested the Hungarian government to place the applicants, as soon as possible, in conditions respecting Article 3 ECHR. Only in four cases the applicants were released from the transit zone, because soon after the interim measures were granted they were granted international protection and, in accordance with the domestic regulations, they were consequently placed in an open reception facility. In the remaining three cases, the applicants remained detained for quite some time. In one case, the HHC requested a second Rule 39, which was also granted, but the applicants were still not released until they finally received international protection.

3. Access to detention facilities

Indicators: Access to Detention Facilities

1. Is access to detention centres allowed to

❖ Lawyers:	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Limited	<input type="checkbox"/> No
❖ NGOs:	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> Limited	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
❖ UNHCR:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> Limited	<input type="checkbox"/> No
❖ Family members:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> Limited	<input type="checkbox"/> No

In October 2017, the authorities terminated cooperation agreements with the Hungarian Helsinki Committee and denied access to police detention, prisons and immigration detention after two decades of cooperation and over 2,000 visits (see [Information for Asylum Seekers](#)).

The HHC lawyers or any other non-government affiliated lawyers do not have direct access to the detention centres or transit zones. The HHC lawyers can only represent the clients if the asylum seekers explicitly communicate the wish to be represented by the HHC lawyer to the IAO (they sign a special form). Once this form is received by the IAO, the HHC lawyers can meet the client in a special room/container located outside the living sector of the detention centre/transit zone. This way the legal aid in the asylum detention and transit zones is seriously obstructed, as free legal advice does not reach everyone in the facility, but only those explicitly asking for it.

²⁹⁶ Cordelia Foundation *et al.*, *From Torture to Detention*, January 2016, 15.

²⁹⁷ *Ibid*, 24.

In principle media and politicians have access to asylum detention, but they need to ask for permission in advance. In practice this rarely happens, since the interest is not very high. Access to the transit zones is more limited; media were let in only on one occasion, soon after the opening of the transit zones, when a press conference was organised by the Ministry of Interior in **Tompa** transit zone on 6 April 2017, which was virtually emptied of its inhabitants for the time of the press conference.²⁹⁸

In asylum detention no NGO is present on a regular basis. In transit zones, the Charity Council,²⁹⁹ which consists of six organisations, is the only organisation which is allowed to enter to provide certain type of assistance to asylum seekers based on an agreement with the Hungarian authorities: Red Cross distributes donations; The Hungarian Ecumenical Aid Organisation distributes donations, holds children programmes and helps in conflict management; The Hungarian Reformed Charity Service distributes donations, organises community programmes and, in case of need, religious programmes; the personnel of the Migration Medical Health Service of the Hungarian-Maltese Charity Service operate a lung-screening bus for the medical screening of asylum seekers' lungs.

D. Procedural safeguards

1. Judicial review of the detention order

Indicators: Judicial Review of Detention

- | | | |
|---|---|-----------------------------|
| 1. Is there an automatic review of the lawfulness of detention? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No |
| 2. If yes, at what interval is the detention order reviewed? | 60 days | |

Asylum seekers are informed of the reasons of their detention and their rights orally in a language that they understand, but the detention order is given to them in Hungarian. Asylum seekers often complain that they were not properly informed, or they did not understand the grounds of their detention and the length thereof.³⁰⁰ The CPT confirmed this and made an explicit recommendation to the Hungarian government regarding this issue, but also noted that the situation in this respect appeared to be less problematic in **Békéscsaba**, where an information office of the IAO was open every weekday and asylum-seekers could ask for updated information.³⁰¹

CPT further finds that: "[...] many foreign nationals (including unaccompanied juveniles) complained about the quality of interpretation services and in particular that they were made to sign documents in Hungarian, the contents of which were not translated to them and which they consequently did not understand."³⁰² And that:

"[A] number of the foreign nationals interviewed during the visit claimed that they had not been informed upon their arrival at the establishment of their rights and obligations in a language they could understand (let alone in writing) and that they had been made to sign documents which they had not understood. They were also uncertain, for example, whether and to whom they could lodge complaints. The examination by the delegation of a number of personal files of detained foreign nationals revealed that some of the files contained a copy of information materials provided to the foreign national concerned. However, in all cases, they were in

²⁹⁸ Hvg, 'Megnéztük a helyet, ahol Németh Szilárd szívesen lakott volna', 6 April 2017, available in Hungarian at: <http://bit.ly/2GwB9xu>; Abcúg, 'Szögesdrótok pókhálója szövi körbe a tranzitónában malmozó menedékkérőket', 7 April 2017, available in Hungarian at: <http://bit.ly/2EU8NA1>; Index.hu, 'Szögesdrótok pókhálója szövi körbe a tranzitónában malmozó menedékkérőket', 7 April 2017, available in Hungarian at: <http://bit.ly/2sPP8wz>.

²⁹⁹ The six members of the national Charity Council are the following: Hungarian Red Cross, Maltese Charity Service, Hungarian Interchurch Aid, Caritas Hungarica, Hungarian Reformed Church, Baptist Aid: <http://karitativtanacs.kormany.hu>.

³⁰⁰ Cordelia Foundation *et al.*, *From Torture to Detention*, January 2016.

³⁰¹ CPT, *Report to the Hungarian Government on the visit to Hungary carried out from 21 to 27 October 2015*, 3 November 2016, paras 58 and 63.

³⁰² *Ibid*, para 59.

Hungarian and only some of them were signed by the foreign national concerned and/or an interpreter.”³⁰³

There are no separate legal remedies against the asylum and immigration detention orders since the IAO’s decision on detention cannot be appealed. The lawfulness of detention can only be challenged through an automatic court review system. Section 31/C(3) of the Asylum Act, however, provides that asylum seekers can file an objection against an order of asylum detention.

In recent years, the effectiveness of judicial review has been criticised by the CoE Commissioner for Human Rights expressed concern as to the lack of effective judicial review,³⁰⁴ UNHCR³⁰⁵ and the UN Working Group on Arbitrary Detention.³⁰⁶

1.1. Automatic judicial review

Judicial review of the administrative decision imposing detention on a foreigner is conducted by first instance courts in case of a decision for the purpose of extending the duration of detention. Detention may initially be ordered by the IAO for a maximum duration of 72 hours, and it may be extended by the court of jurisdiction upon the request of the IAO, which should be filed within 24 hours from the time it has been ordered. The court may grant an extension of asylum detention for a maximum duration of 60 days. Every 60 days, the IAO needs to request the court for another prolongation, 8 working days prior to the due date for extension. The court can prolong detention for 60 days repeatedly up to 6 months. The court has to decide on prolongation before the date of expiry of the detention order.

The hearing in the judicial review procedure is mandatory in the first prolongation procedure (after 72 hours of detention) or if the detained person asks for it when he or she files an objection against the detention order. The court shall appoint a lawyer for the asylum seeker if he or she does not speak Hungarian and is unable to arrange his or her representation by an authorised representative. Asylum seekers are often not informed that they can request a hearing. The HHC’s lawyers report that it often happens that, where an asylum seeker requests a hearing, the court reacts in a discouraging way, asking why he or she has requested a hearing if no change has occurred since the detention was ordered.

Judicial reviews of immigration and asylum detention are conducted mostly by criminal law judges. Judicial review of immigration detention has been found to be ineffective, as Hungarian courts fail to address the lawfulness of detention in individual cases or to provide individualised reasoning based upon the applicant’s specific facts and circumstances. HHC’s analysis of 64 court decisions from February 2014 (as does the experience of HHC lawyers in 2015) confirmed that the judicial review of asylum detention is ineffective because of several reasons:³⁰⁷

Firstly, the proceeding courts systematically fail to carry out an individualised assessment as to the necessity and the proportionality of detention and rely merely on the statements and facts presented in the IAO’s detention order, despite clear requirements under EU and domestic law to apply detention as a measure of last resort, for the shortest possible time and only as long as the grounds for ordering detention are applicable.³⁰⁸ As an extreme example demonstrating the lack of individualisation, 4 decisions of the Nyírbátor District Court analysed by the HHC contained incorrect personal data (name,

³⁰³ *Ibid*, para 62.

³⁰⁴ CoE Commissioner for Human Rights, *Report by Nils Muižnieks Commissioner for human rights of the Council of Europe following his visit to Hungary from 1 to 4 July 2014*, CommDH(2014)21, available at: <http://bit.ly/1e8pS8w>.

³⁰⁵ UNHCR, *UNHCR Comments and recommendations on the draft modification of certain migration, asylum-related and other legal acts for the purpose of legal harmonisation*, January 2015, available at: <http://bit.ly/1GvunEz>.

³⁰⁶ UN Working Group on Arbitrary Detention, *Hungary: UN experts concerned at overuse of detention and lack of effective legal assistance*, 2 October 2013, available at: <http://bit.ly/1IXSvIY>.

³⁰⁷ HHC, *Information Note on asylum-seekers in detention and in Dublin procedures in Hungary*, May 2014.

³⁰⁸ Articles 8(2) and 9(1) recast Reception Conditions Directive; Section 31/A(2) Asylum Act.

date of birth or citizenship of the applicant).³⁰⁹ The judges are only able to make their decisions on the basis of the unilateral information in the motions submitted by the IAO, because the documents supporting those motions are not submitted to the courts. Therefore, it is not really possible to have individualised decisions on each case, resulting in a formulaic nature of the courts' statements of reasons.

Moreover, 4 court decisions contained a date of birth which indicates an age lower than 18 years.³¹⁰ Nevertheless, none of the decisions questioned the lawfulness of detention of the persons concerned, nor did they refer to any age assessment process or evidence proving the adult age of the asylum seeker concerned.

HHC has reported a case where, in the immigration detention facility in **Kiskunhalas** in December 2011, the court decided on detention in groups of 5, 10, or 15 detainees within 30 minutes, thus significantly decreasing the likelihood of a fair and individual review. Such group hearings still continued in 2017. If the asylum seeker has no attorney but one appointed *ex officio*, his or her hearing usually lasts 5 minutes. If a non *ex officio* attorney is present, the hearing lasts 10 minutes. There is no individualised examination, as 10 asylum seekers are interviewed together in one group.

According to a survey conducted by the Hungarian Supreme Court, out of some 5,000 decisions made in 2011 and 2012, only 3 discontinued immigration detention, while the rest simply prolonged detention without any specific justification.³¹¹ The HHC's attorneys report that if the asylum seeker is not represented by an attorney who is not an *ex officio* attorney, the chances of success at the court are equal to zero. If the asylum seeker is represented, then there is a very slim chance that he or she would be released. The same findings apply for 2017.

The 60-day interval for automatic judicial review *per se* excludes the use of detention only for as short a period as possible and only until the grounds for detention are applicable, as it would be required by EU law.³¹² If for any reason, the relevant grounds for detention cease to be applicable, for example, one week after the last judicial review, this fact is extremely unlikely to be perceived by the detaining authority and the detainee will only have the first chance to bring this change to the attention of the district court and request to be released only 53 days later. Therefore, the 60-day intervals cannot be considered as "reasonable intervals" in the sense of Article 9(5) of the Recast Reception Conditions Directive.

The Asylum Working Group of the Supreme Court adopted a summary opinion on 13 October 2014 which, based on a vast analysis of cases and consultations with judges and experts, dealt with a number of different issues including the judicial review of asylum detention. Such summary opinions constitute non-binding guidance to courts, aimed at the harmonisation of judicial practices, and are not related to a particular individual case. The Kúria confirmed HHC's concerns with regard to the ineffectiveness of the judicial review of asylum detention in all aspects, and concluded that "the judicial review of asylum detention is ineffective", for the same reasons as in the case of immigration detention.

The Kúria especially pointed out *inter alia* that judicial decisions are completely schematic and limit themselves to the mere repetition of the arguments submitted by the authority ordering detention; judges are overburdened, insufficiently qualified and not in a position to conduct an individualised assessment, nor able to verify whether or not detention was ordered as a "last resort".

Despite the Supreme Court's very positive analysis and guidance, nothing has changed since then in the practice. The same is true for the similar summary conclusions on immigration detention published in September 2013, which put forward very positive standards, with yet no visible impact on anything.

³⁰⁹ Nyírbátor District Court, Decisions Nos 1.Ir.214/2014/3., 9.Ir.350/2014/3., 1.Ir.728/2013/5., 9.Ir.335/2014/3.

³¹⁰ Nyírbátor District Court case 1.Ir.46/2014/3., Debrecen District Court cases 68.Beü.94/2014/4-I., 68.Beü.108/2014/4, 68.Beü.104/2014/4., 68.Beü.1087/2014/4.

³¹¹ Supreme Court, Advisory Opinion of the Hungarian Supreme Court adopted on 30 May 2013 and approved on 23 September 2013.

³¹² Article 9(1) recast Reception Conditions Directive.

Judges are overburdened, and the irrationally high number of cases they are assigned makes it impossible to provide effective judicial review. A systemic change is desperately needed in order to remedy the situation.

1.2. Objection

According to Section 31/C(3) of the Asylum Act, an asylum seeker may file an objection against the ordering of asylum detention and the denial of certain rights of detainees during detention e.g. right to use a phone, right to special diets etc. The amendments to the Asylum Act that entered into force in January 2018 prescribe that objections should be submitted within 3 days after the issuance of the detention order.³¹³ The objection must be decided upon by the local court within 8 days.³¹⁴ Based on the decision of the court, the omitted measure shall be carried out or the unlawful situation shall be terminated.³¹⁵

In practice, however, the effectiveness of this remedy is highly questionable for a number of reasons. Firstly, an objection can only be submitted against the ordering of asylum detention (i.e. the decision of the IAO, ordering detention for 72 hours). Following the first 72 hours, asylum detention can only be upheld by the local District Court for a maximum period of 60 days. Thus, the legal ground for detention will not be the IAO's decision, but that of the court. This means that only the first type of decision (that of the IAO) can be "objected" against. The objection can therefore still not be regarded as a stand-alone judicial remedy against the detention order, as following the 72-hour period asylum detention is subject to regular period review by the court, yet the period is too long (courts can prolong detention for a maximum of 60 days). Accordingly, the asylum seeker is left with no legal means to challenge the detention order at his or her own initiative (not only during the mandatory periodic judicial review).

Secondly, during the first 72 hours of detention, detained asylum seekers do not have access to professional legal aid. The Asylum Act ensures a case guardian for asylum seekers in asylum detention (who is an attorney at law appointed by the authority), but only for the regular prolongation of detention at 60-day intervals and the judicial assessment of an "objection" that has already been submitted to the court. No case guardian or *ex officio* appointed legal representative is present when asylum detention is ordered, nor is such assistance provided in the first 72 hours of detention. Therefore no legal professional can help the detainee file an objection.

Thirdly, there are also serious general concerns about the effectiveness of information provision upon issuing the detention order. The law provides for an interpreter that the asylum seeker can reasonably be expected to understand. However, asylum seekers in asylum detention unanimously stated to HHC during its monitoring visits in the past that the information provision was more or less limited to the fact that a person is detained and the explanation about the specific grounds or other details, or appeal possibilities were not understood or not even provided.

1.3. No review of placement in transit zones

The IAO issues a ruling ("végzés") ordering the applicant's place of residence in the transit zone based on Sections 80/J(5) and 5(2)(c) of the Asylum Act.³¹⁶ This ruling is not a detention order, as transit zones are not considered places of detention by the government. There is no possibility to seek legal

³¹³ Section 31/C(3) Asylum Act.

³¹⁴ Section 31/C(4) Asylum Act.

³¹⁵ Section 31/C(5) Asylum Act.

³¹⁶ Section 80/J(5) Asylum Act: "The refugee authority shall appoint the territory of the transit zone for the person seeking recognition as place of residence for the period until the adoption of a final decision: this cannot be challenged by way of applications for remedy or when an order on a Dublin transfer becomes enforceable. The person seeking recognition can leave the territory of the transit zone via the exit gate." Section 5(2) Asylum Act: "A person seeking asylum is required:... c) to stay and live in the place of accommodation designated by the refugee authority in due compliance with this Act, and to abide by the rules of conduct in such designated place of accommodation."

remedy against the ruling. It can only be challenged within the potential judicial review request against the future decision of the IAO on the asylum application.

Such a remedy is ineffective for several reasons. On the one hand, asylum seekers granted desired status do not have any interest in appealing a positive decision. Persons who receive protection are released and therefore the appeal against the placement in the transit zone is deprived of meaning since asylum seekers cannot complain about the conditions in the transit zone since they are no longer detained there. Additionally, the HHC is aware of cases where the Szeged Court did not adjudicate on the lawfulness of the asylum seekers' past placement in the transit zone, arguing that there was no need for that since the asylum seeker had been already released from the transit zone.

The HHC is also aware of cases where this type of remedy has already been proved ineffective even in case of those who had a – successful – judicial review performed in relation to the IAO's ruling (as well as the in-merit decision) and who had to stay in the transit zone for the duration of the appeal. Although the Szeged Court found that the IAO's ruling on placement in the transit zone was unlawful and therefore annulled the ruling and ordered the IAO to deliver a new ruling on the placement in the re-opened asylum procedure, the court had not carried out any assessment as to whether the plaintiff's placement in the transit zone was appropriate and met the legal requirements under the recast Reception Conditions Directive and Article 3 ECHR. More importantly, since the court has no reformatory powers, it cannot issue a ruling that would remedy the asylum seeker's situation to avoid future violations. Even in case of annulment, the IAO still avoided compliance with the court's order. The HHC is aware of a case where despite the court ruling that placement in the transit zone was unlawful and ordering that asylum seekers should be placed in another camp, the IAO ignored the court's decision and re-appointed the transit zone as a place of stay in the repeated procedure.

2. Legal assistance for review of detention

Indicators: Legal Assistance for Review of Detention

- | | | |
|--|---|--|
| 1. Does the law provide for access to free legal assistance for the review of detention? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No |
| 2. Do asylum seekers have effective access to free legal assistance in practice? | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No |

Asylum seekers in asylum detention have the same rights regarding legal assistance as those not detained. The same shortcomings apply to the provision of legal assistance (see section on [Regular Procedure: Legal Assistance](#)). HHC provides legal assistance in all detention facilities. HHC lawyers regularly visit asylum detention facilities and immigration detention centres for this purpose every week or second week.

In 2016, the HHC lawyers provided legal advice to 997 asylum seekers detained and represented 178 clients during their judicial review of detention. Data for 2017 are not available.

Asylum seekers can contact their lawyers, if they have one, and meet them in privacy.

Even though the presence of an officially appointed lawyer is obligatory, HHC has witnessed that the lawyers usually do not object to the prolongation of detention. Officially appointed lawyers often provide ineffective legal assistance when challenging immigration detention, which is caused by their failure to meet their clients before the hearing, study their case file, or present any objections to the extension of the detention order. Besides, this *ex officio* legal assistance is only provided at the first court prolongation of the detention order (after 72 hours). This is corroborated by the Hungarian Supreme Court 2014 summary opinion, finding that the *ex officio* appointed legal guardians' intervention is either formal or completely lacking and therefore the "equality of arms" principle is not applied in practice. The CPT observed that:

“[S]ome detained foreign nationals met by the delegation were unaware of their right of access to a lawyer, let alone one appointed ex officio. A few foreign nationals claimed that they had been told by police officers that such a right did not exist in Hungary. Moreover, the majority of those foreign nationals who did have an ex officio lawyer appointed complained that they did not have an opportunity to consult the lawyer before being questioned by the police or before a court hearing and that the lawyer remained totally passive throughout the police questioning or court hearing. In this context, it is also noteworthy that several foreign nationals stated that they were not sure whether they had a lawyer appointed as somebody unknown to them was simply present during the official proceedings without talking to them and without saying anything in their interest.”³¹⁷

In all other instances of the review of detention, the detainees have the right to free legal assistance under the state legal aid scheme, but this assistance is not available in practice.

E. Differential treatment of specific nationalities in detention

The HHC is not aware of differential treatment in terms of specific nationalities being more susceptible to detention or systematically detained. However, in 2016 the HHC’s attorney reported that usually the nationalities that are deemed to be easily deported, such as **Iraqi Kurds** or **Pakistanis**, were not released from detention until the maximum detention period was reached, while the nationalities where deportation was harder – such as Afghans – were released earlier.

³¹⁷ CPT, *Report to the Hungarian Government on the visit to Hungary carried out from 21 to 27 October 2015*, 3 November 2016, para 55.

Content of International Protection

A. Status and residence

Since June 2016, the Hungarian state has completely withdrawn from integration services provided to beneficiaries of international protection, thus leaving recognised refugees and beneficiaries of subsidiary protection to destitution and homelessness. It is only non-governmental and faith-based charity organisations that provide the much needed services aimed at integration such as housing, assistance with finding an employment, learning Hungarian language or family reunification.³¹⁸ In the light of the above mentioned we discuss the content of international protection as follow:

1. Residence permit

Indicators: Residence Permit

1. What is the duration of residence permits granted to beneficiaries of protection?

❖ Refugee status	3 years
❖ Subsidiary protection	3 years
❖ Humanitarian protection	1 year

In Hungary, persons with protection status do not get a residence permit, but a Hungarian ID. For refugees the duration of the status had been 10 years, while for persons with subsidiary protection the duration had been 5 years, but as of 1 June 2016 both were reduced to 3 years. According to the Asylum Act, refugee and subsidiary protection statuses shall be reviewed at least every 3 years.³¹⁹

There are difficulties in the issuance of IDs in practice, notably the fact that it takes at least 1 month to issue an ID. According to the regulations in force from 1 June 2016, persons with international protection status will only be able to stay in the reception centres for 30 days after the delivery of the decision.³²⁰ Therefore by the time they will have to leave the camp, they will still not have their residence permit card, thereby facing greater difficulties in finding a job and accommodation. In 2017 this phenomenon still persists.

In 2017 a client of the HHC received his ID card approximately 1.5 months after the delivery of the international protection status. Presumably the length of the issuance procedure was due to the difficulty in the communication of IAO and the Government Office. In 2016 another client received subsidiary protection after his status had been revoked the same year. Even though the IAO sent the notification of the recognition decision to the Government Office, the latter still had not changed the status of the client in the central system so the issuance of the ID card was not possible in his case.

In practice there is a significant obstacle that child beneficiaries of international protection face in obtaining ID cards in the case that only one of their parents resides with him/her in Hungary. According to the law,³²¹ in order to issue an ID card to children with no legal capacity (below the age of fourteen) both parents' consent is needed. Thus the parent of the child beneficiary of international protection has to set down his/her consent in writing (either in a private document providing full evidence or a statement taken before the Hungarian Consulate) and has to deliver the original copy of it to Hungary. Consequently, it is obvious that in countries of origin such as Syria, Afghanistan or Somalia public service does not function or it functions in a highly limited way, and Hungarian Consulates do not operate. Not to mention the level of public security which amounts to the fact that such a requirement from refugees and beneficiaries of subsidiary protection is absolutely unnecessary and disproportionate

³¹⁸ HHC, *Two years after: What's Left of Refugee Protection in Hungary?*, September 2017, available at: <http://bit.ly/2EdCWqm>.

³¹⁹ Sections 7/A(1) and 14(1) Asylum Act.

³²⁰ Section 32(1) Asylum Act.

³²¹ Section 20 Government Decree 414/2015 (XII.23.) on the issuance of ID card and on the uniform image and signature recording rules.

and means that the law is not tailored to the situation of beneficiaries of international protection. HHC is aware of a case where it took approximately one year to obtain an ID card for a 10 year old boy as a result of the afore-mentioned issues.

As regards renewal, refugees prior to 2016 did not have problems renewing their Hungarian ID after 10 years, as this was done automatically. However, persons with subsidiary protection could not merely renew their Hungarian ID, but the authorities had to examine *ex officio* whether conditions for subsidiary protection were still met. According the new regulations, both refugee and subsidiary protection status have to be examined by the IAO *ex officio* after at least 3 years from the day the status was granted.

2. Civil registration

2.1. Registration of child birth

Pursuant to the Act on Civil Registration Procedure,³²² within one day of the birth of a child, parents have the obligation to register his/her birth at the competent Registry Office which issues the birth certificate. Neither HHC nor Menedék Association are aware of any cases regarding problems as to birth registration. Main challenges concern the establishment and registration of the new born child's citizenship. Those children whose parents are beneficiaries of international protection are registered as unknown citizens since Hungary does not have the competency to establish the nationality of another country. Provided that parents cannot contact the embassy of their country of origin in order to register their child, the new born remains an unknown citizen.

According to the current Hungarian legislation, children of persons with international protection do not receive Hungarian citizenship *ex lege* at birth, which is a clear violation of Article 1(2)(a)-(b) of the 1961 Convention on the Reduction of Statelessness and Article 6(2)(b) of the 1997 European Convention on Nationality. Furthermore, it is in breach of Articles 3 and 7 of the 1989 Convention on the Rights of the Child.³²³ According to the Menedék Association, the struggle of obtaining citizenship for the child leads to frustration and anxiety for parents with international protection.

2.2. Registration of marriage

As regards marriage in general, the same rules are applied to beneficiaries of international protection and to Hungarian nationals. There is only one additional requirement that refugees and persons with subsidiary protection have to fulfil. As it is set out in Act on Civil Registration Procedure, non-Hungarian citizens have to prove that no obstacle of the marriage exists pursuant to their personal law.³²⁴ The term "personal law" is defined in the Act on International Private Law,³²⁵ meaning the law of any State of which the person is a national. Therefore in practice beneficiaries of international protection would have the obligation to contact their embassy which on one hand might be dangerous for the person. On the other hand it is prohibited by the Asylum Act to do so, unless the person loses his/her status. In this case, the Act on Civil Registration Procedure enables the applicants to ask for an exemption from the Registry Office³²⁶ and gives exemption *ex lege* in cases when the country of origin is knowingly unable to issue the required certificate.³²⁷ As per the experiences of Menedék Association requests for exemption are mostly accepted by the Registry Office, nonetheless they are aware of a case when during the asylum procedure the applicant claimed to be married but lost his wife soon afterwards. As a result of the lack of proper Somalian state registration and since the refugee was not able to contact the

³²² Act I of 2010 on Civil Registration Procedure.

³²³ "Until 2002, the relevant Law-Decree did not contain any specific guidance for cases where the new-born child's nationality was not proven (e.g. neither of the parents was a Hungarian citizen, etc.). Based on anecdotal information and data gathered from individual cases known to the author, it appears that the practice was to register children automatically as having the same nationality as their parents." Source: Gábor Guylai, *Nationality unknown? An overview of the safeguards and gaps related to the prevention of statelessness at birth in Hungary*, January, 2014 available at: <http://bit.ly/2oelgUC>.

³²⁴ Section 23(1) Act on Civil Registration Procedure.

³²⁵ From 1 January 2018, Section 15 of Act XXVIII of 2017 on International private law.

³²⁶ Section 23(1) Act on Civil Registration Procedure.

³²⁷ Section 23(2) Act on Civil Registration Procedure.

embassy due to his fear of persecution, there was no way to prove the death of his wife with documents and to certify the change in his marital status.

3. Long-term residence

Indicators: Long-Term Residence

1. Number of long-term residence permits issued to beneficiaries in 2017: 0

Long-term residence is regulated by the TCN Act. Long-term residence status could be granted to those refugees or beneficiaries of subsidiary protection who have lawfully resided in the territory of Hungary continuously for at least the preceding three years before the application was submitted.³²⁸ Continuity assumes that a person has not stayed outside the territory of Hungary for more than 270 days at all.³²⁹ In practice, the 3-year term of residence must be understood as starting when people with international protection status have already moved out of the reception facilities and established a domicile.

An application for long term residence permit can be submitted only if the applicant has a valid passport. This results in difficulties for most of the people granted international protection.

According to law, the applicant has to submit the documents in proof of means of subsistence in Hungary and the Hungarian existing residence, such as the comprehensive health insurance.³³⁰

The IAO has 70 days to examine the case and take a decision.³³¹ The long-term residence permit is granted for an indefinite term of time but the document has to be renewed every 5 years.

There are no different criteria for refugee status and people granted subsidiary protection.

According to the TCN Act, in cases of exceptional circumstances the third-country national may be given a national permanent residence permit by decision of the minister in charge of immigration even in the absence of the relevant statutory requirements. The minister in charge of immigration may consider the individual circumstances, family relationships and health conditions of the third-country national as exceptional circumstances, and may take into account the economic, political, scientific, cultural and sporting interests of Hungary.³³²

4. Naturalisation

Indicators: Naturalisation

1. What is the waiting period for obtaining citizenship?

❖ Refugees	3 years
❖ Subsidiary protection beneficiaries	8 years
2. Number of citizenship grants to beneficiaries in 2017: Not available

The main criteria for naturalisation are laid down in Section 4(1) of the Citizenship Act as the following:

- (a) The applicant has resided in Hungary continuously over a period of eight years;
- (b) According to Hungarian laws, the applicant has a clean criminal record and is not being indicted in any criminal proceedings before the Hungarian court;
- (c) The applicant has sufficient means of subsistence and a place of residence in Hungary;
- (d) His or her naturalisation is not considered to be a threat to public policy or to the national security of Hungary; and
- (e) The applicant provides proof that he or she has passed the examination in basic constitutional studies in the Hungarian language, or of his or her exemption from such examination.

³²⁸ Section 35(1)(a) TCN Act.

³²⁹ Section 35(2) TCN Act.

³³⁰ Section 94(1) TCN Decree.

³³¹ Section 35(6) TCN Act.

³³² Section 36(1) TCN Act.

The minimum period of residence prior to the naturalisation application is shorter for a number of categories of applicants treated preferentially. Recognised refugees and stateless persons are two of the categories benefitting from preferential treatment, and are required to have resided in Hungary continuously for a period of at least three years prior to the submission of the application.³³³ Although regarding stateless persons the actual waiting time is 6 years, since they are not entitled to establish a domicile after they were granted stateless status. In practice, this means that stateless persons at first have to apply for a national long-term residence permit and only after obtaining it together with the registered domicile can they apply for Hungarian citizenship. According to the Menedék Association, in practice after 3 years with an established domicile refugees cannot be granted citizenship, because they would have troubles fulfilling other criteria due to lack of proper integration support.

The aforementioned provision clarifies the distinction between refugee status and subsidiary protection, which means that preferential treatment, is afforded only to those bearing refugee status, while persons with subsidiary protection need to fulfil the condition of living 8 years prior to submitting the application. The Asylum Act expressly states that beneficiaries of subsidiary protection shall not be entitled to the conditions for preferential naturalisation made available to refugees in the Citizenship Act.³³⁴

Applications for citizenship were adjudicated by the IAO until the end of 2016. On the basis of legislative changes, since the beginning of 2017, citizenship is examined by the Government Office of Budapest. The petition can be submitted at any local government office which transfers the case file to the Government Office of Budapest.

As indicated in the study on Hungarian nationalisation written in 2016 by the HHC's Gábor Gyulai,

"[O]fficial foreign documents must go through diplomatic legalisation (authentication) before submission, unless this would take an unreasonably long time (according to the declaration of the competent consular officer) or if this would result in seriously adverse legal consequences for the applicant. This latter exception could constitute an important safeguard for refugees and other beneficiaries of international protection; nonetheless, there is no information whether it is applied as such in practice."³³⁵

As the law states, decisions in connection with petitions for the acquisition of Hungarian citizenship by way of naturalisation or repatriation shall be adopted by the President of the Republic based upon the recommendation of the Minister of Interior.³³⁶ As clients of HHC state, there has been a new practice carried out by the Government Office of Budapest recently of holding an interview with the applicant about the details of his or her professional and private life, worldview, plans etc. There is no procedural deadline set out in the law concerning the maximum deadline for a decision, although the Government Office of Budapest shall forward the applications for naturalisation to the Minister of Interior within three months.³³⁷ In practice the general procedural time takes approximately one year.

The President of the Republic shall issue a certificate of naturalisation attesting the acquisition of Hungarian citizenship. Subsequently, the applicant must take a citizenship oath or pledge of allegiance, for which the invitation shall be sent by the mayor of the district of his or her residence.³³⁸ The naturalised person shall acquire Hungarian citizenship on the date of taking the oath or pledge of allegiance.

In practice, the applicant has to wait for a long time – meaning at least 6 months – for a decision. Since the decision on granting citizenship is not an administrative one, it cannot be appealed, nor can judicial review be mounted against the decision. Therefore the procedure for naturalisation lacks the provision

³³³ Section 4(2) Citizenship Act.

³³⁴ Section 17(4) Asylum Act.

³³⁵ HHC, *The Black Box of Nationality: The naturalisation of refugees and stateless persons in Hungary*, 2016, available at: <https://goo.gl/V7OVT5>, 18.

³³⁶ Section 6(1) Citizenship Act.

³³⁷ Section 17(2) Citizenship Act.

³³⁸ Section 4(2) Citizenship Act.

of information and the most basic procedural safeguards of transparency, accountability and fair procedure.³³⁹

5. Cessation and review of protection status

Indicators: Cessation

1. Is a personal interview of the beneficiary in most cases conducted in practice in the cessation procedure? ☒ Yes ☐ No
2. Does the law provide for an appeal against the first instance decision in the cessation procedure? ☒ Yes ☐ No
3. Do beneficiaries have access to free legal assistance at first instance in practice? ☐ Yes ☒ With difficulty ☐ No

5.1. Criteria for cessation and revocation

The Asylum Act rules the grounds for cessation of status and the revocation of the recognition under the same Section.³⁴⁰ Section 11(1) provides that refugee status shall cease if (i) the refugee acquires Hungarian nationality or (ii) recognition as refugee is revoked by the refugee authority. There are several grounds of revocation determined in the law as follows:³⁴¹

- (a) The refugee has voluntarily re-availed him or herself of the protection of the country of his or her nationality;
- (b) The refugee has voluntarily re-acquired his or her lost nationality;
- (c) The refugee has acquired a new nationality and enjoys the protection of the country of his or her new nationality;
- (d) The refugee has voluntarily re-established him or herself in the country which he or she had left or outside which he or she had remained owing to fear of persecution;
- (e) The circumstances in connection with which he or she has been recognised as a refugee have ceased to exist, subject to the exception of a well-founded fear arising from past persecution;³⁴²
- (f) The refugee waives the legal status of refugee in writing;
- (g) The refugee was recognised in spite of the existence of the reasons for exclusion referred to in Section 8(1) of the Asylum Act or such a reason for exclusion prevails in respect of his or her person;
- (h) The conditions for recognition did not exist at the time of the adoption of the decision on his/her recognition;
- (i) The refugee concealed a material fact or facts in the course of the procedure or made a false declaration in respect of such a fact or facts or used false or forged documents, provided that this was decisive for his or her recognition as a refugee.

Pursuant to amendments entering into force on 1 January 2018 the grounds of exclusion from refugee status have been extended. According to Section 8(5) of the Asylum Act a foreigner sentenced by a court's final and enforceable resolution for having committed a crime which is punishable by at least five years' imprisonment may not be recognised as a refugee. The recently introduced provision clearly violates Article 1F(b) of the Geneva Convention since it prescribes that only those are excluded from refugee status who had committed a crime "outside the country of refuge prior to his or her admission to that country as a refugee". Furthermore, this is the only provision of the January 2018 amendments which has to be applied already in ongoing procedures. This amendment is further aggravated by the fact that the amended Asylum Act provides that the IAO may not deviate from the opinion of the special

³³⁹ HHC, *The Black Box of Nationality*, 2016, 20.

³⁴⁰ Sections 11 and 18 Asylum Act.

³⁴¹ Section 11(2) Asylum Act.

³⁴² Section 11(4) Asylum Act.

authorities (not just in exclusion cases).³⁴³ The IAO is also authorised to take data from the INTERPOL FIND international database and use them in the asylum proceedings.³⁴⁴

The IAO shall also revoke the recognition as a refugee if a court with a final and absolute decision sentences the refugee for having committed a crime which is according to law punishable by five years or longer term imprisonment.³⁴⁵

The conditions for the cessation of subsidiary protection status are mainly the same as those concerning refugee status.

5.2. Procedures and guarantees

Proceedings for the withdrawal of refugee status or subsidiary protection are opened *ex officio*.³⁴⁶ The rules of the general asylum procedure shall be applied during the withdrawal proceedings.³⁴⁷ The IAO shall interview the person holding international protection status and in 60 days decide if the conditions of refugee status or subsidiary protection are still applicable. If there is no ground of the revocation of status, the proceedings shall be terminated.

The resolution on the withdrawal of recognition of refugee status or subsidiary protection may be subject to judicial review.³⁴⁸ The petition for judicial review shall be submitted to the refugee authority within 8 days following the date of delivery of the decision.³⁴⁹ The petition for judicial review shall be decided by the court, within 60 days following receipt of the petition, in contentious proceedings. The court review shall provide for a full and *ex nunc* examination of both facts and points of law.³⁵⁰ The court may not overturn the decision of the IAO, but shall only abolish the decision it finds unlawful and, if necessary, shall order the refugee authority to reopen the case. The court's decision adopted in conclusion of the proceedings is final, and it may not be appealed.³⁵¹

With regard to cessation for reasons of changed circumstances, the HHC has not observed cessation being applied to specific groups of beneficiaries of international protection. There are many cases where Afghan beneficiaries of subsidiary protection do not have their status renewed after 5 years because the IAO considers that return to **Afghanistan** would be safe. In these cases, the IAO systematically claims Kabul as an internal protection alternative for Afghans whose region of origin is struggling with instability, even though the deteriorating situation of the capital is reported by different sources.

In 2016, the IAO issued 73 cessation and withdrawal decisions, among which 4 regarding refugee status and 69 regarding subsidiary protection beneficiaries. In 2017, IAO issued 81 cessation and withdrawal decisions, among which 1 regarding refugee status (having Lebanese nationality) and 80 regarding subsidiary protection beneficiaries. Among the 80 cessation and withdrawal decisions there were 52 Afghan citizens. Out of the total number of the withdrawal decisions regarding subsidiary protection there were 3 persons having Syrian and 4 persons having Iraqi citizenship.³⁵² Grounds for such decisions are not disaggregated.

The following examples of the HHC's experience in cessation cases are illustrative of Hungarian practice with regard to cessation on grounds of individual conduct:

1. In one case, a refugee from **Afghanistan** wanted to reunite with his family. The IAO was taking a long time to decide and they were demanding an increasing number of new documents from him. The refugee decided to go to Iran, where his family was present, in order to arrange these

³⁴³ Section 57 Asylum Act.

³⁴⁴ Section 86/A Asylum Act.

³⁴⁵ Section 11(3) Asylum Act.

³⁴⁶ Section 72/A(1) Asylum Act.

³⁴⁷ Section 72/A(2) Asylum Act.

³⁴⁸ Section 75(1) Asylum Act.

³⁴⁹ Section 75(2) Asylum Act.

³⁵⁰ Section 75(3) Asylum Act.

³⁵¹ Section 75(5) Asylum Act.

³⁵² Information provided by IAO, 12 February 2018.

documents himself. He went with his wife to the Afghan Embassy in Tehran to obtain related family documents. After this, they went to the Hungarian Embassy in Tehran and they handed over these documents. The Hungarian Embassy informed the IAO about this, and the IAO started a cessation procedure to determine whether to withdraw his refugee status or not. The HHC represented the man in this case and successfully submitted to the IAO that he was not seeking the protection of the authorities of his country of origin, but only intended to arrange documents. The IAO finally did not withdraw his refugee status.

2. In another case, a Palestinian refugee from **Syria** wanted to reunite with his 4 children and his wife. His wife gave an interview at the Hungarian Embassy in Lebanon when they applied for the family reunification visa, but because there were some contradictions between the man's statements in his asylum interviews, and his wife's statements at the Embassy, the IAO started a cessation case against the man to see if his refugee status should be withdrawn. The HHC represented the man and took part in very tense interviews, but finally his status was not withdrawn.
3. The HHC only heard about a case where an **Afghan** refugee's status was actually withdrawn because he went back to Afghanistan to take part at a family funeral. The HHC has not seen the file of this case.
4. There was another man from **Afghanistan**, whose subsidiary protection was withdrawn after he went back to Afghanistan to visit his family. He went back because he could not reunite with them due to his status in Hungary. He appealed against the decision and the court ordered IAO to conduct a new procedure. IAO did, and again rejected his claim, saying that he should return to Afghanistan. He appealed again, and in this second court procedure, the court finally granted him the subsidiary protection.³⁵³
5. In one case, a Somali man with subsidiary protection contacted the Embassy of Somalia after he obtained information about the identity of his real parents and requested a new birth certificate stating the names of his biological parents. The IAO started the revocation procedure on the basis that the beneficiary of international protection voluntarily re-availed himself of the protection of his country of origin. During the personal hearing it turned out that the man never visited the Embassy in person but contacted them by post. Finally the IAO terminated the procedure and maintained his subsidiary protection.

6. Withdrawal of protection status

See the section on [Cessation and Review](#).

³⁵³ Metropolitan Court, Judgment No 27.K.32.862/2015/3.

B. Family reunification

1. Criteria and conditions

Indicators: Family Reunification

1. Is there a waiting period before a beneficiary can apply for family reunification?
☐ Yes ☒ No
2. Does the law set a maximum time limit for submitting a family reunification application?
❖ General conditions: All beneficiaries ☐ Yes ☒ No
❖ Preferential conditions: Refugees ☒ Yes ☐ No
3 months
3. Does the law set a minimum income requirement?
❖ General conditions: All beneficiaries ☒ Yes ☐ No
❖ Preferential conditions: Refugees ☐ Yes ☒ No

Under Hungarian law, the applicants for family reunification are the family members of the refugee in Hungary, not the refugees themselves. The family members have to apply at the Hungarian consulate. According to the law, applicants for family reunification shall lawfully reside in the country where they submit the claim.³⁵⁴ Refugees' family members are often themselves refugees in countries neighbouring the country of origin. In most cases, the family members stuck in the first country of asylum are unable to obtain a legal status (and documentary proof thereof) there that would be considered as "lawful stay" in the sense of Hungarian law. This is particularly problematic for Palestinians from Syria, who are refused legal entry into Lebanon and Jordan or Ethiopians who are not able to obtain visas into Egypt.

Although family members are required to apply at the competent Hungarian consulate, it is the IAO that considers the application and takes a decision. On the one hand, the applicants are required to prove their relationships with the sponsor and the necessary resources to return to their country of origin. On the other hand, the sponsor has to verify his/her subsistence, accommodation, and a comprehensive health insurance for the family members. According to the Hungarian law, there is no time limit for family reunification.

In Hungary, only refugees are entitled to family reunification under favourable conditions within three months following the recognition of their status.³⁵⁵ They are exempted from fulfilling the usual material conditions: subsistence, accommodation, health insurance. No preferential treatment is applied for beneficiaries of subsidiary protection. Most persons who received subsidiary protection in 2017 in Hungary were Syrian, Afghan, Iraqi and Somali nationals, whose reasons for fleeing their countries of origin were very similar to those of refugees. They hardly ever have the means to fulfil the strict material conditions for family reunification. Consequently, the lack of any preferential treatment *de facto* excludes beneficiaries of subsidiary protection from the possibility of family reunification, which often has a harmful impact on their integration prospects as well.

There are no particular treatments for **Syrians** with regards to rights granted after being granted a status. According to the HHC's experience, family members of the Syrian nationals, provided with protection in Hungary, are facing difficulties with getting family reunification visas where they have no valid passports. These difficulties are faced by other nationalities as well, not just Syrians. Recently family reunification became more difficult since the authorities are even stricter regarding the documents. Now they request that all the documents bear an official stamp from the authorities, proving that they are originals, as well as an official stamp from the Hungarian consulate. All documents have to be translated into English or Hungarian, which is very costly. The decisions made by the IAO are predominantly based on these documents and there is relatively small space for other ways to prove family relations. This is especially relevant to DNA tests which can't be requested by the applicants as of 2017, but it has to be ordered by the IAO.

³⁵⁴ Section 47(2) TCN Decree.

³⁵⁵ The favourable rule was amended by Section 29 Decree 113/2016. (V.30).

Hungary does not accept certain travel documents, such as those issued by **Somalia** for example. Nevertheless, unlike other EU Member States, Hungary refuses to apply any alternative measure that would enable for a one-way travel with the purpose of family reunification in such cases.³⁵⁶ Consequently, certain refugee families are *de facto* excluded from any possibility of family reunification based on their nationality or origin.

127 family reunification applications were submitted to the IAO in 2016, of which 80 applications were approved and 30 appeal cases are pending.³⁵⁷ Data for 2017 were not provided.

2. Status and rights of family members

When granted residence permission and a visa, family members of the sponsor have 30 days from entering Hungary to either take the residence permit or apply for asylum. In the asylum procedure, family members of recognised refugees are automatically granted the same status as the sponsor, as stated in the Asylum Act.³⁵⁸ However, according to the definition of family members provided by the Asylum Act,³⁵⁹ only the sponsor's children, spouse and parents are considered family members. Adult children and siblings are not automatically granted refugee status. Regardless of the connection, all family members are required to submit an application and start the procedure.

Family members of beneficiaries of subsidiary protection are not automatically granted subsidiary protection, they have to apply for asylum and prove their cases.

During the asylum procedure, family members of the sponsor have the same rights as asylum seekers. Under Hungarian law, asylum seekers who obtain legal residence in Hungary, do not have to move into the transit zones and are able to apply for a designated place of residence in private accommodation. This practically means that before applying for asylum, the grantees of family reunification actually obtain their residence permits. In case they decide not to apply for asylum but take their residence permit, they will not have the same rights and entitlements of the sponsor.

C. Movement and mobility

1. Freedom of movement

Refugees and beneficiaries of subsidiary protection have freedom of movement within the territory of the State. There is no related restriction prescribed in law. Most NGOs providing shelter for refugees and persons with subsidiary protections are located in **Budapest**, which means that the placement of beneficiaries is mainly concentrated in the capital of Hungary.

2. Travel documents

The duration of validity of travel documents issued to beneficiaries of international protection is one year, both for persons with refugee status and subsidiary protection. Refugees receive a "refugee passport", a bilingual travel document specified in the 1951 Refugee Convention, while holders of subsidiary protection receive a special travel document, not a refugee passport.³⁶⁰

³⁵⁶ Alternative measures applied by other Member States include the issuance of a specific temporary *laissez-passer* for foreigners (e.g. Sweden, Netherlands, France, Austria, Italy), the acceptance of specific travel documents issued by the Red Cross for the purpose of family reunification (e.g. Austria, UK) and the use of the so-called EU Uniform Format Form, based on Council Regulation (EC) No 333/2002 of 18 February 2002 on a uniform format for forms for affixing the visa issued by Member States to persons holding travel documents not recognised by the Member State drawing up the form (e.g. UK, Germany).

³⁵⁷ Information provided by the IAO, 20 January 2017.

³⁵⁸ Section 7(2) Asylum Act.

³⁵⁹ Section 2(j) Asylum Act.

³⁶⁰ Sections 10(3)(a) and 17(2) Decree 101/1998. (V. 22.) on the execution of Act XII of 1998 on travelling abroad.

A refugee is entitled to a bilingual travel document under the Refugee Convention, unless compelling reasons of national security or public order otherwise require.³⁶¹ There are no geographical limitations, except for travelling to the country of origin.

The IAO can deny the issuing of a travel document for beneficiaries of international protection in case the National Security Authority, the National Tax and Customs Administration of Hungary or the Police provides information to the IAO according to which the person should not get a travel document for reasons of national security and public order.³⁶² The resolution rejecting the issuance of a bilingual travel document to the refugee may be subject to judicial review.³⁶³ As it is fixed in the Asylum Act, the petition for judicial review shall be submitted to the refugee authority within 3 days following the date of delivery of the decision.³⁶⁴ The IAO shall, without delay, forward the petition for judicial review to the competent court together with the documents of the case and any counterclaim attached.³⁶⁵ The petition for judicial review shall be adjudged by the court within 8 days in non-contentious proceedings, relying on the available documents.³⁶⁶ The court may overturn the decision of the refugee authority. The court's decision adopted in conclusion of the proceedings is final, and it may not be appealed.³⁶⁷

For beneficiaries of subsidiary protection, rules established relating to refugees are applied.

In practice in order to receive the travel document beneficiaries of international protection have to apply in a separate form at the competent office of IAO. The fee of the procedure is around €20 and the applicant needs to have his or her ID card and the address card. Obtaining the latter could be problematic because of the difficulties beneficiaries face concerning housing. The authority issues the travel document within 22 working days.³⁶⁸

According to the statistics of IAO, 1,654 travel documents were issued to beneficiaries of international protection in 2017.³⁶⁹

D. Housing

Indicators: Housing

- | | |
|--|---------|
| 1. For how long are beneficiaries entitled to stay in reception centres? | 30 days |
| 2. Number of beneficiaries staying in reception centres as of 31 December 2017 | 67 |

Recognised refugees and beneficiaries of subsidiary protection can stay in the reception centre for 30 days after their recognition.³⁷⁰ In practice, this means that they are required to leave the centres before being issued with an ID (see section on [Residence Permit](#)). Since the March 2017 Amendments entered into force, beneficiaries of international protection were accommodated in Vámoszabadi, although since September 2017 they are placed in Kiskunhalas, as well. Besides accommodation, people are entitled to food during their 30-day stay. Persons with permission to stay can be placed in the community shelter in **Balassagyarmat**. In the experience of HHC most of the beneficiaries leave the country a few days after their release from the transit zone.

The July 2013 amendments to the Asylum Act had introduced a new integration system moving away from camp-based integration to community-based integration. As of January 2014, integration support

³⁶¹ Section 4/A Asylum Decree.

³⁶² Section 4/A Asylum Decree.

³⁶³ Sections 10(5) and 17(2a) Asylum Act.

³⁶⁴ Section 10(6) Asylum Act.

³⁶⁵ Section 10(6) Asylum Act.

³⁶⁶ Section 10(7) Asylum Act.

³⁶⁷ Section 10(8) Asylum Act.

³⁶⁸ IAO, *Kétnyelvű úti okmányok kiállítása*, available at: <http://bit.ly/2jrKbou>.

³⁶⁹ Information provided by IAO, 12 February 2018.

³⁷⁰ Section 41(1) Asylum Decree.

was provided via an integration contract concluded by the asylum authority and the person granted international protection upon request of the latter within 4 months following their recognition. The maximum period of validity of the contract was 2 years. The amount of integration support was set in the integration contract and the services are provided via the family care service of the local municipality. A social worker was appointed supporting the beneficiary of international protection throughout the integration process.

In April and June 2016, as a result of legislative changes, all forms of integration support were eliminated. Therefore since the entry into effect of Decrees 113/2016 and 62/2016 and the June 2016 amendment to the Asylum Act, beneficiaries of international protection are no longer eligible to any state support such as housing support, additional assistance and others.

NGOs and social workers have reported extreme difficulties for refugees moving out of reception centres and integrating into local communities in practice.³⁷¹ Accommodation free of charge is provided exclusively by civil society organisations and churches. Among the latter the Lutheran Church and the Baptist Aid have to be emphasised. They run homes mostly in **Budapest**. The Government recently announced that they are stopping all AMIF funding for 2019, on which NGOs providing integration support relied.³⁷² According to SOS Children's Villages the majority of those remaining in Hungary could be provided with accommodation at the end of their 30 days reception centre housing even though the number of sufficient places are due to the fact that only a few people choose to settle in Hungary. Due to the lack of apartments on the market, the rental fees are too high to be affordable for beneficiaries who have just been granted status. In addition to these difficulties, landlords prefer to let their apartments to Hungarian rather than foreign citizens.

A further problem is the difficulty of getting an address card. Landlords usually require prospective tenants to have an address card which is impossible to obtain, unless someone has a contract and the confirmation statement of the owner of the flat that he or she can use the address as his domestic address.

E. Employment and education

1. Access to the labour market

Refugees and persons with subsidiary protection have access to the labour market under the same conditions as Hungarian citizens.³⁷³ This means that no labour market test is applicable in employment regarding beneficiaries. There is only one provision established by the Asylum Act which results an exception from the general regulations. According to the Asylum Act, beneficiaries may not take up a job or hold an office or position which is required by law to be filled by a Hungarian citizen.³⁷⁴ Typically the positions of public servant and civil servant demand Hungarian citizenship even though these can be fulfilled by persons having a long-term residence permit.

There is no data available for the employment of beneficiaries, thus the effectiveness of their access to employment in practice cannot be measured. In practice, the main obstacle beneficiaries of international protection have to face is the Hungarian language. There is no special existing state support for the purpose of obtaining employment. Beneficiaries of international protection are entitled to use the services of the National Labour Office under the same condition as Hungarian citizens, even though it is hard to find an English-speaking case officer to help to beneficiaries seeking jobs.

³⁷¹ EASO, *Description of the Hungarian asylum system*, May 2015, 10.

³⁷² Belügyi Alapok, 'Tájékoztatás pályázati kiírások visszavonásáról – 2018.01.24.', available in Hungarian at: <http://bit.ly/2CzR1Nv>.

³⁷³ See the general right to equal treatment in Section 10(1) Asylum Act.

³⁷⁴ Section 10(2)(b) Asylum Act.

In practice, having recognised that the absence of social capital and the knowledge of local language and culture pose major challenges for beneficiaries seeking housing and jobs, the Menedék Association helps beneficiaries to find a job through the “MentoHRing” programme launched in June 2016.³⁷⁵ Maltese Care Nonprofit Ltd. similarly to Menedék Association offers services for beneficiaries of international protection regarding finding jobs. Within their project, called “Jobs for you” individual labour market counselling, labour market training and personalized help with job seeking are offered.

In practice, due to language and cultural barriers, access to employment is limited to certain sectors such as physical labour (as working in a kitchen, storage etc.) and hospitality. The average working hours are 12 hours per day, which render integration of beneficiaries more difficult, since they do not have any free time beside their work. It is also important to note that employers usually treat beneficiaries of international protection less favourably than Hungarian citizens and they often lack trust towards foreigners.

2. Access to education

In the case of unaccompanied children, the law provides a right to education. The reception centre and guardians struggle with actively assisting children to enrol in schools and helping them to attend classes. Unaccompanied children who have been granted international protection are enrolled in the mainstream Hungarian child welfare system and the same rules apply to them as to all other children, which means the right to education.

Education for unaccompanied children is in practice provided by a limited number of public schools in Budapest. Effective access to education became more difficult in 2017. Since many unaccompanied children regard Hungary as a transit country for various reasons, it may be the case that they drop out of school once enrolled. Schools that provide places find it hard to manage the high fluctuation of children in various classes due to the increased level of central control over educational management. This effectively creates a vicious circle: effective education may serve as a pull factor and encourage children to stay. The already limited number of schools however are reluctant to take unaccompanied minors for fear of them leaving Hungary and thus dropping out. The lack of access to education however serves as a push factor for many children who argue that staying in Hungary is not a realistic option for them since they cannot receive proper formal education.

In the case of children with families, the situation is also difficult. Hardly any school is ready to offer the specialised care and support that refugee children need. The growing anti-refugee sentiment may make it even more difficult for schools to admit children receiving international protection for fear of facing a backlash from parents or donors.

The Menedék Association provides a so-called school programme to all children hosted in **Fót**, which consists of games and learning through play. Though attendance is not compulsory, based on HHC lawyers’ experience on the field children do make a point to attend since they consider it as a useful gateway to formal education. Menedék also offers preparatory classes for those who are about to enter formal education.

Young adults and adults normally have access to courses offered by NGOs or independent bodies such as the Central European University. Those unaccompanied children receiving a protection status before they turn 18 are eligible to aftercare services, which grants them the right to free education and housing until they turn 24.³⁷⁶

³⁷⁵ See the programme at: <http://menedek.hu/en/projects/mentohring>.
³⁷⁶ Section 77(1)(d), (2) and Section 93 Child Protection Act.

F. Social welfare

In general, the law provides access to social welfare for beneficiaries of international protection and does not make any distinction between refugees and subsidiary protection beneficiaries.³⁷⁷ Therefore beneficiaries of international protection are entitled to attendance of persons in active and retired age, limited public health care and unemployment benefit, amongst other entitlements. Social welfare is provided to beneficiaries under the same conditions and on the same level as for nationals.

Nevertheless, there are several forms of social assistance offered by the local government which require the beneficiary to already have a certain number of years of established domicile. The rules set out by local governments can vary. For example, pursuant to decrees of local governments only those people who have been residing for certain year in the area of the local government and can provide it by an address card are entitled to apply for social housing provided by local governments. Obviously beneficiaries of international protection cannot comply with the requirement right after they get out of reception facilities or transit zones.

Social assistance is either provided by the competent district government offices or the local governments.

As to managing social welfare issues, difficulties mainly stem from the common slowness and tardiness of the administration system and from the general language barriers owing to the lack of interpreter provided to refugees or persons with subsidiary protection.

G. Health care

According to the Hungarian Health Act,³⁷⁸ beneficiaries of international protection fall under the same category as Hungarian nationals. Refugees and persons with subsidiary protection are entitled to health services under the same conditions as asylum seekers for 6 months after the date when international protection was granted to them. Before June 2016, this period was 1 year.

In practice, similar to asylum seekers, beneficiaries face significant barriers regarding access to health care. Barriers are mainly stem from language difficulties, lack of interpreters or the lack of basic knowledge of English of the doctor and also emerge as a result of administrative difficulties and as a lack of awareness of law. According to research from 2017 which is based on interviews carried out with 18 refugees and 4 social workers, it can be assessed that refugees generally feel marginalised in the healthcare system.³⁷⁹ The research highlights the importance of social workers and volunteers who “act as links between health care system and refugees” helping with interpretation and as an information point for the health care institute’s personnel. Not only adult refugees but unaccompanied children who were granted international protection face the difficulties explained above. In case of children Menedék Association has seen incidents when the hospital even raised serious doubts about the child’s age and attempted to get rid of the responsibility to treat the patient even though the children’s age was established by a forensic medical examiner in the asylum procedure.

As to the issuance of health insurance card besides the cited research, SOS Children’s Villages notes that it is extremely problematic since it takes long time until the beneficiary of international protection is provided with the card.

³⁷⁷ Ministry of Human Resources, *Tájékoztató a szociális ellátásokról*, 2017, available in Hungarian at: <http://bit.ly/2E1PPm>.

³⁷⁸ Section 3(s) Act CLIV of 1997 on Health Care.

³⁷⁹ Mangeni Akileo, *Marginalization of refugees and asylum seekers in the healthcare system: A Hungarian case study*, Central European University, 2017.

ANNEX I - Transposition of the CEAS in national legislation

Directives and other CEAS measures transposed into national legislation

Directive	Articles	Deadline for transposition	Date of transposition	Official title of corresponding act	Web Link
Directive 2011/95/EU Recast Qualification Directive	All	21 December 2013	- 15 June 2013 - 1 July 2013 - 15 March 2014 - 1 July 2014 - 1 August 2015	Act XCIII of 2013 Act CXXVII of 2015	http://bit.ly/1OeEGiQ (HU)
Directive 2013/32/EU Recast Asylum Procedures Directive	43	20 July 2015 Article 31(3)-(5) to be transposed by 20 July 2018	- 1 August 2015 - 15 September 2015	Act CVI of 2015; Act CXXVII of 2015 Act CXL of 2015	http://bit.ly/1j702Dp (HU)
Directive 2013/33/EU Recast Reception Conditions Directive	8-11	20 July 2015	- 15 June 2013 - 1 July 2013 - 1 August 2015	Decree of the Minister of the Interior No. 29/2013 Act XCIII of 2013 Act CXXVII of 2015	http://bit.ly/1WYqEJE (HU)

Main findings on discrepancies in transposition and gaps in implementation

Provision in Directive / Regulation	Provision in National Law / Practice
Article 3 recast Reception Conditions Directive	Reception Conditions Directive is not fully applied in the transit zones, which is against the Article 3 of the Directive, which provides that the Directive should apply also at the border.
Article 8(1) recast Reception Conditions Directive	Automatic detention of asylum seekers in the transit zone is clearly not in line with the Directive.
Article 8(2) recast Reception Conditions Directive	Article 31/A(2) Asylum Act transposes it in an almost literal way, according to which Member States may detain an applicant if its purpose cannot be achieved through measures securing availability and it proves necessary and on the basis of an individual assessment of each case'. However the provision of the Directive has not been transposed in a conforming manner, due to the fact that the Hungarian national law does not provide the factors that need to be taken into account during the individual assessment of the asylum seeker. No clear criteria can be located in the Act on

	<p>Asylum as regards the individual assessment, therefore it is the sole discretionary power of the refugee authority to detain an applicant instead of using other measures securing availability. Detention orders lack individualisation and alternatives are not assessed automatically. Also “house arrest” imposed on those asylum seekers who are under criminal procedure due illegal crossing of the border does not constitute a less coercive alternative to detention.</p> <p>By automatically detaining every asylum seeker (except unaccompanied minors below 14 years of age, the Hungarian legislation is clearly not in line with the Reception Conditions Directive.</p>
<p>Article 8(3)(f) recast Reception Conditions Directive</p> <p>Article 28(3) Dublin III Regulation</p>	<p>Article 31/A(1)(f) Asylum Act transposes those provisions in a non-conform manner. According to the Directive provision, an applicant may be detained in accordance with Article 28 of the Dublin Regulation, which provides that the person shall no longer be detained ‘when the requesting Member State fails to comply with the deadlines for submitting a take charge or take back request or where the transfer does not take place within the period of six weeks referred to in the third subparagraph. Despite this fact, the Asylum Act does not exclude Dublin detainees from the scope of Article 31/A(6) of the Asylum Act which means that the maximum length of detention may reach 6 months in case of Dublin detainees as well.</p>
<p>Article 8(4) recast Reception Conditions Directive</p>	<p>Article 2(I), Article 31/A(2) and Article 31/H(1) Asylum Act transpose this in a non-conform manner. According to the Directive provision Member States shall ensure that the rules concerning alternatives to detention are laid down in national law. The Hungarian national law lists the possible alternative measures, however there is a lack of a detailed regulation on the application of alternative measures. Clear criteria for the application of each alternative measure should be laid down in the Asylum Act for the purpose of legal clarity.</p> <p>There are no alternatives to the detention in the transit zones.</p>
<p>Article 9(1) and (5) recast Reception Conditions Directive</p>	<p>Article 31/A(6)-(7) and Article 31/A(8) Asylum Act transpose it in a non-conform manner. According to the Directive provision an applicant shall be detained only for as short period as possible. Despite this fact, the Asylum Act foresees an excessively long maximum period for the judicial prolongation of detention (60-day interval), so in practice 60 days shall pass until the judicial review of detention regardless of the situation (for example: mental state) of the applicant concerned in the detention centre. This 60-day interval cannot be regarded as ‘a short period’. Practice so far shows that the asylum authority, for reasons of administrative convenience, automatically requests the court to prolong detention for the maximum period of 60 days. Furthermore, it should be mentioned that asylum detention may last for thirty days in case of a family with minors according to the Hungarian law.</p> <p>Detention in the transit zone lasts until the end of asylum procedure, which is definitely not for the shortest time possible.</p> <p>The detention of families with children is a form of discrimination on the ground of the family status of the child as detention of unaccompanied / separated asylum-seeking children are prohibited by Hungarian law, whereas the same national law provides a ground for detention of children who are accompanied by a family member. This is contrary to international human rights standards, in particular Article 2(2) of the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child.</p> <p>All families with children as well as unaccompanied minors above the age of 14 are automatically detained in the transit zones for indefinite period of time.</p>
<p>Article 9(2) recast Reception Conditions Directive</p>	<p>Asylum seekers detained in the transit zones receive no detention order.</p>

Articles 9(3), 9(4) and 9(5) recast Reception Conditions Directive	There is no possibility to appeal against the placement to the transit zones until the final decision in the asylum procedure is issued. The applicants are not informed of this possibility, since it does not exist.
Article 11(1), second sub-paragraph recast Reception Conditions Directive	Article 37/F(2) Asylum Act, Article 3(4)-(6) and Article 4 Decree 29/2013 of the Minister of the Interior transpose it in a non-conform manner. The Directive provision requires Member States, if vulnerable persons are detained to ensure regular monitoring and adequate support taking into account their particular situation, including their health. Article 4 of Decree 29/2013 ensures appropriate specialist treatment of the injuries caused by torture, rape or other violent acts to any detained person seeking recognition based on the opinion of the physician performing the medical examination necessary for admission. Nevertheless, the wording of Article 4 of Decree 29/2013 excludes from the scope of vulnerable persons: minor, elderly or disabled person, pregnant woman, single parent raising a minor child, victims of human trafficking, persons with serious illnesses, and persons with mental disorders. No systematic, specialised and state-funded medical care and monitoring is ensured for victims of torture or other forms of violence in asylum or immigration detention.
Article 11(2) and 11(3) recast Reception Conditions Directive	Minors are not detained as a last resort, but automatically if they are below 14 years of age or with a family. Their best interest is not taken into consideration and there are no activities appropriate to their age for teenage unaccompanied minors.
Article 11(5), first sub-paragraph recast Reception Conditions Directive	Article 31/F(1) Asylum Act, Article 36/D(3) Asylum Decree and Article 3(8) Decree 29/2013 of the Minister of the Interior transpose it in a not conform manner. The Directive provision requires Member States, where female applicants are detained, to ensure that they are accommodated separately from male applicants, unless the latter are family members and all individuals concerned consent thereto. Nevertheless, the Hungarian law does not require all individuals' concerned consent to accommodate family members together in detention centres, it is automatic.
Article 14(1) recast Reception Directive	Education provided in transit zone definitely does not meet the standards required by the Directive.
Article 15 recast Reception Directive	This Article is clearly breached, since asylum seekers in Hungary do not have a right to work, not even after 9 months.
Article 17(2) recast Reception Directive	The conditions in the transit zone are clearly not adequate.
Article 18(2)(c) recast Reception Directive	Several professional NGOs active in the field of asylum for decades are not allowed to enter the transit zones.
Article 19(2) recast Reception Conditions Directive	No systematic, specialised and state-funded medical care and monitoring is ensured for victims of torture or other forms of violence in asylum or immigration detention or in the transit zones.
Article 20 recast Reception Conditions Directive	The provisions transposing this article are suspended for the time of mass migration emergency.
Article 21 recast Reception Conditions Directive	Article 2(k) Asylum Act: The definition of 'applicant with special reception needs' as referred to in Article 2(k) of the recast Reception Conditions Directive is not correctly transposed into the Hungarian legal system as in the definition of 'person in need of special treatment' victims of human trafficking, persons with serious illnesses, and persons with mental disorders are not mentioned.
Article 22 recast Reception Conditions Directive	There is no official protocol and effective identification mechanism in place to systematically identify torture victims and other vulnerable asylum seekers in the framework of the asylum procedure or when ordering or upholding detention, in breach of the Recast Reception Conditions Directive.

Article 23 recast Reception Conditions Directive	Placement of minors in transit zone is not in compliance with this provision. No rehabilitation services are provided.
Article 24(1) recast Reception Conditions Directive	The system of temporary guardians appointed in the transit zones is not in line with this provision.
Article 24(2) recast Reception Conditions Directive	Transit zones are not an appropriate accommodation for unaccompanied minors.
Article 25(1) recast Reception Conditions Directive	No systematic, specialised and state-funded medical care and monitoring is ensured for victims of torture or other forms of violence in asylum, immigration detention or transit zones.
Article 25(2) recast Reception Conditions Directive	In breach of Article 25(2) of the recast Reception Conditions Directive, there is no systematic training for those who order, uphold or carry out the detention of asylum seekers regarding the needs of victims of torture, rape or other serious acts of violence.
Article 26 recast Reception Conditions Directive	Domestic law does not provide any legal remedy to complain against the conditions in the transit zone.
Article 28 recast Reception Conditions Directive	No appropriate monitoring of transit zones is ensured.
Article 4(3) recast Asylum Procedures Directive	According to Article 4(3), Member States shall ensure that the personnel of the determining authority are properly trained and persons interviewing applicants shall also have acquired general knowledge of problems which could adversely affect the applicants' ability to be interviewed, such as indications that the applicant may have been tortured in the past. No similar provision could be located in the Hungarian transposing measures (paras 1.2.7.2 and 1.2.8.2 of Joint order No. 9/2010 of the Minister of the Interior and the Minister of Public Administration and Justice).
Article 6(1), second subparagraph, Article 6(2) and Article 9 recast Asylum Procedures Directive	<p>The provision foresees that registration shall take place 'no later than six working days' after the application is made, if the application for international protection is made to other authorities which are likely to receive such applications, but not competent for the registration under national law. As referred to in Article 35(1)(b) Asylum Act, if an application for international protection was submitted to any other authority, asylum procedure shall commence from the registration of the application by the refugee authority. However no provision regarding the timeframe of the registration by the refugee authority can be located in the Hungarian implementing measures.</p> <p>EU law obliges Hungary to ensure that every person in need of international protection has effective access to the asylum procedure, including the opportunity to properly communicate with the competent authorities and to present the relevant facts of his or her case. EU law also provides that asylum seekers should – as a general rule with very strict exceptions – be provided with the right to stay in the Member State's territory pending a decision by the competent asylum authority. Under the amended Asylum Act and the Act on State Border, the Hungarian police automatically pushes out from Hungarian territory any irregular migrant apprehended anywhere on the territory, regardless of eventual protection needs or vulnerabilities, denying any opportunity to file an asylum claim.</p> <p>Further on, extremely limited acceptance into the transit zone is incompatible with Article 6(2) of the recast Asylum Procedures Directive.</p>
Article 7(4) recast Asylum Procedures	Article 46(f)(fa) Asylum Act provides that in the case of a crisis situation caused by mass immigration there is no

Directive	place for initiating the designation or designating a case guardian to an unaccompanied minor. This is not in line with the Directive provision which obliges Member States to ensure that the appropriate bodies have the right to lodge an application for international protection on behalf of an unaccompanied minor.
Article 8(2) recast Asylum Procedures Directive	Access of NGOs to the transit zone is hindered.
Article 10(3)(a) and 38(2)(c) recast Asylum Procedures Directive	In border procedures, the Asylum authority decides on the admissibility of the application with priority but not later than within 8 days as set out in Article 71/A(3) Asylum Act . In many cases the Asylum authority actually delivers an inadmissibility decision at the transit zone in less than an hour. Such speedy decision-making gives rise to evident concerns regarding the quality and the individualisation of asylum proceedings as required by Article 10(3)(a) of the recast Asylum Procedures Directive, the individual examination of whether the third country concerned is safe for a particular applicant as set out in Article 38(2)(c) of that Directive and the application of even the most basic due process safeguards.
Article 15(2) recast Asylum Procedures Directive	Confidentiality during the interviews was not always ensured in the transit zones, when because of the heat the doors of a container were opened and the policeman standing in front of the door could hear everything, or IAO officers who were not conducting the interview would be coming in and going out during the interview.
Article 15(3)(c) recast Asylum Procedures Directive	Interpreters are not always adequate.
Article 24(1) recast Asylum Procedures Directive	Article 3 Asylum Decree transposes this provision, however not in a conform manner. The Directive provision requires Member States to assess within a 'reasonable period of time' after an application for international protection is made whether the applicant is an applicant in need of special procedural guarantees. The Hungarian law provides that the refugee authority shall assess whether the person seeking international protection is in need of special treatment or not. However, there is no formal identification mechanism in place and the 'reasonable period of time' is not implemented by the Hungarian law. Therefore it is not exactly clear when the examination process is carried out by the refugee authority and without this time guarantee, an asylum seeker belonging to vulnerable group may lose the ability to benefit from the rights and comply with the obligations provided for an 'applicant in need of special procedural guarantees'. Furthermore, there is a huge concern on how the refugee authority examines the applicant as the employees of the refugee authority are neither doctors nor psychologists (assumed based on Article 3(2) Asylum Decree). Hence it is not clear how and in what basis they can make judgment on whether an applicant is a victim of torture, rape or suffered from any other grave form of psychological, physical or sexual violence. Based on Article 3(2) of the Asylum Decree, the refugee authority 'may' use the assistance of a medical or psychological expert, therefore it is clear that people working for the refugee authority are not medical or psychological experts.
Article 24(3), first sub-paragraph recast Asylum Procedures Directive	Article 29 Asylum Act, Article 33(1) and Article 35(4) Asylum Decree conform to Article 24(3), first subparagraph of the Directive. However it should be mentioned that the Hungarian transposing provision does not determine detailed rules on how and in what form adequate support shall be provided to the persons in need of special treatment. The Hungarian law only ensures separated accommodation in the reception centre for persons seeking international protection in cases justified by their specific individual situation as referred to in Article 33(1) of the Decree.
Article 24(4) recast Asylum Procedures	The transposition of Article 24(4) into the Hungarian law could not be located.

Directive	
Article 25(1), first sentence recast Asylum Procedures Directive	Article 46(f)(fa) Asylum Act transposes it in a non-conform manner. The Directive provision requires Member States to take measures as soon as possible to ensure that a representative represents and assists the unaccompanied minor to enable him or her to benefit from the rights and comply with the obligations provided for in the recast Asylum Procedures Directive. Nevertheless, the Hungarian law provides that in the case of a crisis situation caused by mass immigration there is no place for initiating the designation or designating a guardian <i>ad litem</i> to an unaccompanied minor. This is not in alignment with the Directive provision.
Article 25(3)(a)-(b) recast Asylum Procedures Directive	The transposition of this provision into the Hungarian law could not be located.
Article 25(5), first sub-paragraph recast Asylum Procedures Directive	Article 44(1) Asylum Act and Article 78(1)-(2) Asylum Decree conform to Article 25(5), first subparagraph of the Directive. Based on Article 78(2) of the Asylum Government Decree, if the person seeking recognition debates the outcome of the expert examination regarding his or her age, he or she may request a new expert to be designated by the refugee authority. In case of contradicting expert opinions, it is up to the refugee authority to decide whether to appoint another expert or to determine which expert opinion shall be used regarding the age of the applicant. This provision is not in alignment to the Directive provision as if Member States still have doubts concerning the applicant's age after the age assessment, they shall assume that the applicant is a minor.
Article 25(5), second sub-paragraph recast Asylum Procedures Directive	The transposition of this provision into the Hungarian law could not be located. In practice the age assessment methods are definitely not adequate.
Article 25(6) recast Asylum Procedures Directive	Article 51(7) and Article 71/A(7) Asylum Act transpose Article 25(6)(a) of the Directive. Article 51(7) of the Asylum Act incorrectly transposes it, as the Hungarian law does not exclude unaccompanied minors from the scope of accelerated procedure, while the provision of the Directive permits unaccompanied minors to be channelled into an accelerated procedure only in cases specified in Article 25(6)(a)(i)-(iii).
Article 26 recast Asylum Procedures Directive	Asylum seekers are automatically detained in transit zones and no speedy judicial review is available.
Articles 37-38 recast Asylum Procedures Directive	<p>These have not been transposed into Hungarian law in a conform manner, due to the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - According to Articles 1-2 Government Decree 191/2015 (entering into force on 1 August 2015), candidate states of the European Union qualify as a safe country of origin and as a safe third country. The Hungarian government adopted a national list of safe third countries, which includes – among others – Serbia (candidate states of the European Union). This decision contradicts the UNHCR's currently valid position, according to which Serbia is not a safe third country for asylum seekers, and the guidelines of the Hungarian Supreme Court (Kúria) and the clear-cut evidence provided by the reports of the HHC and Amnesty International. Currently there is no other EU Member State that regards Serbia as a safe third country for asylum seekers. - The amendment to the Asylum Act obliges the IAO to reject as inadmissible all asylum claims lodged by applicants who came through a safe third country, since the applicant "could have applied for effective protection there" as referred to in Article 51(2)(e) and Article 51(4)(a)-(b) Asylum Act. As over 99% of asylum seekers entered Hungary at the Serbian-Hungarian border section in 2015, this means the quasi-automatic rejection at first glance of over 99% of asylum claims, without any consideration of protection needs. This is in violation of Article 10(3)(a) of the recast Asylum Procedures Directive as well which requires Member

	<p>States to ensure that applications are examined and decisions are taken individually, objectively and impartially.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Hungary has not laid down rules in its national law on the methodology by which the competent authorities may satisfy themselves that a third country may be designated as a safe third country within the meaning of Section 2(i) of the Act on Asylum. Nor is any explanation or justification provided in Government Decree 191/2015 as to how the Government arrived at the conclusion that each country listed qualifies as safe. <p>The criteria listed in Article 38(1) of the recast Asylum Procedures Directive are not applied.</p>
Article 43(3) recast Asylum Procedures Directive	<p>Article 5(1)(b) and Article 71/A(2) Asylum Act transpose this in a non-conform manner. Based on the Directive provision, in the event of arrivals involving a large number of third-country nationals or stateless persons lodging applications for international protection at the border or in a transit zone, which makes it impossible in practice to apply the basic principles and guarantees of Chapter II of the Directive, the border procedure may be applied where and for as long as these third-country nationals or stateless persons 'are accommodated' normally at locations in proximity to the border or transit zone. Nevertheless, Article 71/A(2) of the Asylum Act which deals with the rights of the applicant lodging applications for international protection at the border, provides that the applicants shall not be entitled to receive accommodation as referred to in Article 5(1)(b) of the Asylum Act.</p>
Article 46(3) recast Asylum Procedures Directive	<p>This provision is not transposed into the Hungarian law in a correct manner. Pursuant to Article 53(4) of the Asylum Act the judge has to take a decision in 8 days on a judicial review request against an inadmissibility decision and in an accelerated procedure. The 8-day deadline for the judge to deliver a decision is insufficient for "a full and <i>ex nunc</i> examination of both facts and points of law" as prescribed by EU law. Five or six working days are not enough for a judge to obtain crucial evidence (such as digested and translated country information, or a medical/psychological expert opinion) or to arrange a personal hearing with a suitable interpreter. During the judicial review the court is limited to an <i>ex tunc</i> rather than an <i>ex nunc</i> examination of both facts and law, i.e. the facts and law as applicable at the time of the original decision, and not that of the review. The restrictions introduced to the judicial review of admissibility decisions taken in border procedures in the transit zones, in particular regarding the scope of the review and the possibility of a hearing, do not meet the requirements for an effective remedy under the Recast Asylum Procedures Directive. Judicial decisions taken by court secretaries (a sub-judicial level) lacking judicial independence also seem to be in breach of the Asylum Procedures Directive.</p>
Article 46(5) and (8) recast Asylum Procedures Directive	<p>Articles 45(5)-(6) and Article 53(2) Asylum Act transpose this provision in a non-conform manner. Based on the Directive provision, Member States shall allow the applicant to remain in the territory pending the outcome of the procedure to rule whether or not the applicant may remain on the territory, laid down in paragraphs 6 and 7 of Article 46 of the Directive. Nonetheless, the Hungarian law does not ensure suspensive effect on the enforcement of the refugee authority's decision as set out in Article 53(2) of the Asylum Act (with the exception of decisions made under Articles 51(2)(e) and 51(7)(h)). Instead, pursuant to Article 45(6) of the Asylum Act, the refugee authority in its decision refusing the application for recognition, withdraws the foreigner's residence permit issued for humanitarian purposes, orders his or her expulsion and deportation based on Act II of 2007 on the entry and stay of third country nationals and determines the period of prohibition of entry and residence.</p> <p>It should be highlighted that the Hungarian law only foresees the expulsion by way of deportation for asylum seekers whose application for recognition had been refused as referred to in Article 45(6) of the Asylum Act. Nevertheless,</p>

	<p>according to Article 7(4) Return Directive Member States may refrain from granting a period for voluntary departure, or may grant a period shorter than seven days, if there is a risk of absconding, or if an application for a legal stay has been dismissed as manifestly unfounded or fraudulent, or if the person concerned poses a risk to public policy, public security or national security. Based on the provision of the Return Directive, Hungary would be required to carry out an individual assessment in each case to see whether the asylum seekers whose application for recognition had been refused ‘pose a risk to public policy, public security or national security’, if there is a risk of absconding, before deciding to refrain from granting a period for voluntary departure and carry out expulsion by way of deportation. This is not the case in the Hungarian transposing measure, as it automatically requires expulsion by way of deportation for asylum seekers whose application for recognition had been refused. It should be also noted that no specialised authority takes part in the procedure conducted at the border as set out in Article 71/A(8) of the Asylum Act, therefore the Constitution Protection Office and the National Counterterrorism Centre (specialised authorities) are not involved to determine whether the stay of the persons presents a threat to national security.</p>
Article 18(2) Dublin III Regulation and Article 28(3) of recast Procedures Directive	<p>For persons whose applications are considered to have been tacitly withdrawn (i.e. they left Hungary and moved on to another EU member state) and the asylum procedure had been terminated, the asylum procedure may be continued if the person requests such a continuation within 9 months of the withdrawal of the original application as referred to in Section 66(6) Asylum Act. Where that time limit has expired, the person is considered to be a subsequent applicant. However, imposing a deadline in order for the procedure to be continued is contrary to the Article 18(2) of Dublin III Regulation, as when the Member State responsible had discontinued the examination of an application following its withdrawal by the applicant before a decision on the substance has been taken at first instance, that Member State shall ensure that the applicant is entitled to request that the examination of his or her application be completed or to lodge a new application for international protection, which shall not be treated as a subsequent application as provided for in the recast Asylum Procedures Directive. This is also recalled in Article 28(3) of the recast Asylum Procedures Directive, which explicitly provides that the aforementioned 9-month rule on withdrawn applications “shall be without prejudice to [the Dublin III Regulation].”</p> <p>Persons who withdraw their application in writing cannot request the continuation of their asylum procedure upon return to Hungary; therefore they will have to submit a subsequent application and present new facts or circumstances. This is also not in line with above-described second paragraph of Article 18(2) of the Dublin III Regulation, which should be applied also in cases of explicit withdrawal in writing and not only in cases of tacit withdrawal. This is problematic in the view of recent practices in Hungary when detained asylum seekers withdraw their applications in order to be released from asylum detention. By imposing detention on asylum seekers returned under the Dublin III Regulation, in practice the refugee authority promotes the option of withdrawal amongst them. This practice can be interpreted as a disciplinary use of detention against those who lodge an asylum claim in Hungary.</p>