# Contents

Acknowledgements ........................................................................................................... vii

Chapter 1  Introduction

1.1 From globetrotting to city hopping .............................................................................. 1
1.2 The scope of this research ......................................................................................... 9
1.3 Structure of the book ................................................................................................. 13

Part I  Strasbourg

Chapter 2  Strasbourg adjudication of the public interest in immigration law

2.1 Introduction .................................................................................................................. 21
   2.1.1 Selection of cases ................................................................................................. 21
   2.1.2 Methodical aspects ............................................................................................ 23
   2.1.3 Categories of reasons for denying residence ...................................................... 24
2.2 Criminal offences ....................................................................................................... 28
2.3 National security ........................................................................................................ 35
2.4 National health ........................................................................................................... 40
2.5 Income-related criteria ............................................................................................... 42
   2.5.1 Income requirements mentioned only in describing the facts of the case ........ 43
   2.5.2 Income requirements ‘in principle not considered unreasonable’ ..................... 43
   2.5.3 Lack of income reflecting the socio-economic ties with the host country ...... 48
   2.5.4 The link between insufficient income and the national economic well-being ... 53
   2.5.5 A Lack of income affecting public order? ......................................................... 56
   2.5.6 Summary ........................................................................................................... 58
2.6 Procedural rules of immigration law ......................................................................... 60
   2.6.1 Infringement of procedural rules as the main reason for denying residence .... 61
   2.6.2 Infringement of procedural rules as one among other reasons for
       denying residence ................................................................................................... 91
   2.6.3 Overview: the Court’s approach to infringement of procedural
       immigration rules ................................................................................................... 103
2.7 Individual interest-related criteria ............................................................................. 106
   2.7.1 Introduction ....................................................................................................... 106
   2.7.2 The individual interest represented in individual interest-related criteria ...... 112
   2.7.3 The public interest in upholding individual interest-related criteria ............... 125
   2.7.4 Procedural aspects of immigration law as additional obstacles ..................... 127
   2.7.5 Summary ........................................................................................................... 129
2.8 Overview of the ECtHR’s approach to national reasons for denying residence

Chapter 3 Revisiting Article 8 ECHR immigration-cases in view of indicative factors

3.1 Introduction

3.2 Article 8 ECHR immigration cases in a flowchart

3.3 Predicting the outcome of Article 8 ECHR immigration cases?

Chapter 4 The ECtHR’s approach expounded

4.1 Introduction

4.2 The ECtHR’s approach framed in terms of judicial deference

4.2.1 A full margin of appreciation in setting out restrictive immigration criteria and in balancing the interests at stake

4.2.2 Subsumption rather than balancing competing interests

4.3 Defining the boundaries of Strasbourg scrutiny in Article 8 ECHR immigration cases

4.3.1 Aspects specific to immigration and those which are not

4.3.2 A comprehensive picture of Strasbourg scrutiny in Article 8 ECHR immigration cases

4.4 A distorted perception of the scope of Strasbourg scrutiny

4.4.1 Preaching balancing while practicing full deference

4.4.2 A potential bias in the political and legal discourse on the national level

4.4.3 A generic interest in controlling immigration as a stand-alone justification for denying residence

4.5 Technical obstacles for reconciling a generic State right to control immigration with protecting family and private life

4.5.1 Judicial balancing requires a ‘valuable’ public interest

4.5.2 A balanceable right with no minimum protection in relation to either of the competing interests

Part II Luxembourg

Introduction

Chapter 5 Income requirements for economically active Union citizens

5.1 Introduction

5.2 Legal framework
5.2.1 Workers ................................................................................................................. 182
5.2.2 Jobseekers and ex-workers .................................................................................... 185

5.3 Luxembourg scrutiny of income-related restrictions to workers ...................... 188
   5.3.1 The element of remuneration in the worker definition ........................................ 188
   5.3.2 The required duration of economic activities ....................................................... 193
   5.3.3 Economically active Union citizens in receipt of social benefits ...................... 195

5.4 Overview and analysis of the ECJ’s approach to income requirements in
relation to economically active Union citizens ......................................................... 196
   5.4.1 General outline .................................................................................................... 197
   5.4.2 The interests of relevance in adjudicating the scope of the worker definition . 200

Chapter 6 Income requirements for economically non-active Union citizens

6.1 Introduction .................................................................................................................. 205
6.2 Legal framework ......................................................................................................... 205
6.3 Luxembourg scrutiny of income restrictions to non-active Union citizens .... 208
   6.3.1 Grzelczyk (Case C-184/99) ................................................................................ 209
   6.3.2 Baumbast (Case C-413/99) ................................................................................. 213
   6.3.3 Trojani (Case C-456/02) ..................................................................................... 216
   6.3.4 Zhu and Chen (Case C-200/02) .......................................................................... 218
   6.3.5 Commission v Belgium (Case C-408/03) ............................................................. 221
   6.3.6 Commission v the Netherlands (Case C-398/06) .............................................. 225
   6.3.7 Brey (Case C-140/12) ......................................................................................... 226

6.4 Overview and analysis of the ECJ’s approach ......................................................... 230
   6.4.1 Outline of the ECJ’s approach ........................................................................... 230
   6.4.2 The interests of relevance ................................................................................... 231

Chapter 7 Income requirements for family members of Union citizens

7.1 Introduction .................................................................................................................. 233
7.2 Family members within the scope of Directive 2004/38 .................................... 233
   7.2.1 Family members falling within the scope of Article 2(2) of Directive 2004/38 233
   7.2.2 Family members falling under the scope of Article 3(2) of Directive 2004/38. 237

7.3 Regulation 1612/68: Children of (former) EU migrant workers and their
primary carers ............................................................................................................... 240
7.4 Family members of Union citizens who reside in their home Member State. 244
   7.4.1 The right to return - Eind .................................................................................. 245
   7.4.2 The right to enjoy EU citizenship – the Zambrano doctrine ............................ 249

7.5 Summary ..................................................................................................................... 257
Chapter 8  Income requirements under the Family Reunification Directive

8.1 Introduction .................................................................................................................. 259
8.2 Income conditions in the Directive .............................................................................. 259
8.3 The ECJ’s interpretation of Directive 2003/86......................................................... 261
  8.3.1 Parliament v Council, Case C-540/03 ................................................................. 262
  8.3.2 Chakroun, Case C-578/08 .................................................................................. 263
  8.3.3 O, S, and L, Joint cases C-356/11 and C-357/11 .............................................. 270
8.4 Summary and conclusion ............................................................................................. 273

Chapter 9  The consistency of the ECJ’s approach to national restrictions

9.1 Introduction .................................................................................................................. 277
9.2 Outline of the ECJ’s approach to income-related conditions ................................. 277
  9.2.1 A strict, purpose-related, case-by-case scrutiny of national restrictions ...... 277
  9.2.2 The significance of the individual interest in (a family member) being
      granted residence ........................................................................................................ 279
  9.2.3 A reason-specific approach to national restrictions to free movement
      and family reunification? .............................................................................................. 282
9.3 The ECJ’s approach to other types of restrictions ...................................................... 283
  9.3.1 Criminal convictions ............................................................................................ 284
  9.3.2 Procedural requirements ...................................................................................... 289
  9.3.3 Personal ties .......................................................................................................... 297
  9.3.4 Integration requirements ....................................................................................... 301
9.4 Conclusion: A common approach to national measures restricting the right
      to free movement and family reunification ................................................................ 313
  9.4.1 A strict means-end-based interpretation of restrictions to rights and the
      obligation to apply only customised assessment standards .................................. 313
  9.4.2 The relevance of the interests at stake according to the type of restriction ...... 314
  9.4.3 The significance of generic interests in controlling or restricting
      immigration in Luxembourg scrutiny ....................................................................... 319

Part III  Conclusion

Chapter 10  The interest of States in controlling and restricting
immigration as a marker for the scope of judicial scrutiny

10.1 Introduction ............................................................................................................... 323
10.2 Strasbourg: A decision-model that leaves the legitimacy of controlling
      and restricting immigration unquestioned .............................................................. 324
10.3 No easy remedy for the Strasbourg contradiction .................................................. 327
10.4 Justifying the Strasbourg status quo? ...................................................................... 329
10.5 Luxembourg: prioritisation of immigration as a starting point .................... 332
  10.5.1 Strict, means-end, case-by-case, substantive scrutiny of national restrictions ................................................................. 332
  10.5.2 The link between promoting an aim that involves immigration and the scope of judicial scrutiny ................................................................. 334

Bibliography ........................................................................................................................................................................... 337

Table of Cases ......................................................................................................................................................................... 343

Summary .................................................................................................................................................................................. 351