

Brussels, 3 July 2001

10525/01

LIMITE

**COPEN 34
ENFOPOL 70**

NOTE

from : General Secretariat
to : Ad Hoc meeting on follow-up to the Göteborg events on 4 July
Subject : [&](#)

1. Within the framework of the meeting of the European Judicial Network in Stockholm from 18 to 20 June 2001, the Swedish Presidency convened a meeting of certain specialised prosecutors and members of Pro Eurojust. The meeting was chaired by Mrs Solveig Riberdahl, Deputy Prosecutor General of Sweden, and attended by 25 Prosecutors representing all Member States of the Union.
2. One Prosecutor from Göteborg informed the participants of the close cooperation that had taken place between the Prosecutors and the police in advance of the meeting and of the current situation. 400 persons had been arrested but they had to be released, under Swedish legislation, within 12 hours. That meant that a number of persons that had been arrested on the Thursday were back on the streets again on Friday when the most violent demonstrations took place. 50 persons were currently in custody by order of the Court. It was expected that some 400 persons would have to be identified in the future and that an extensive international judicial cooperation was needed. Currently, 10 prosecutors were working on the cases. Since carrying masks in demonstrations were permitted in Sweden, this could cause problems for future identifications. The groups were well organized, the police had arrested a commando centre of 12 persons in an apartment that was equipped with computer and radio communications.

3. An exchange of views took place. The following may be noted:

- One Member State has a 24 hour possibility to keep demonstrators. On two different occasions, Member States had used immigration laws to keep violent demonstrators further and/or to expel them. This situation could be legally unsatisfactory.
- Close co-operation between police and prosecutors was always necessary. Standard letters rogatory had been prepared before EURO 2000 and contact points in the most concerned countries had been established to enable them to respond within 24 hours.
- Before EURO 2000, the police had exchanged names on potential hooligans. It was proposed that one should compare these lists with the current ones from Göteborg.
- There are also some aspects concerning terrorism a special cooperation had been set in place for competent authorities before EURO 2000.
- One experience from events such as this one is that there are a number of police on the streets to keep order, but when they are arrested there is not enough police to investigate and begin to gather evidence the judicial case gets a very bad start and this has repercussions later in the criminal process.
- Experience from other cases is that Internet and strong encryption (128 bit) is used by these groups. In one case, it was not possible to crack the encryption.
- It was suggested that various EU bodies such as the European Judicial Network or Eurojust could, from a prosecutorial point of view, analyse these cases and gather experience. Contacts could for instance take place between prosecutors in Genua, Brussels, Netherlands, Germany and Göteborg to ensure that experiences are exchanged. Such bodies could in the future assist in organising co-ordination and planning meetings between competent judicial authorities.
- Europol could in the future when they have competence carry out an analysis on these events.
- One country is able to issue restriction orders to known hooligans that will have to report to the police in their country, and will thus not be able to travel to the event abroad.
- One country can in exceptional circumstances prolong the detention for arrested hooligans.
- Eurojust and the European Judicial Network could in the future assist in developing a strategy for these situations.

- It was thought that criminal organisations are behind these events in most cases as they are so well organised.
- Harmonisation on legislation at European level should intervene.
- Several of the prosecutors present were ready to share their experiences and invited their colleagues to come to them to study how they had organised the prevention.
- Pictures of known hooligans could be exchanged over the Internet.
- One practical problem concerned lack of interpreters when the hooligans were arrested.
- It was suggested to create a Network within the Network and arrange a special meeting for specialised prosecutors on this issue
