

Supreme Administrative Court Interpretative case No. 1/2019

RIGHT TO ASYLUM, CHILD RIGHTS

REJECTED INTERPRETATIVE JUDGMENT REQUESTS TO THE SUPREME ADMINISTRATIVE COURT

RIGHT TO ASYLUM & CHILD RIGHTS – restrictive interpretation of a legal interest of a minor to appeal an accommodation order

- Request for an interpretative judgment about the application of Article 44, para 6 and para 9 of the **Foreigners** in the Republic of Bulgaria Act with respect to unaccompanied minors and the application of § 1, item 4 of the Asylum and Refugees Act on the following questions:
- 1. Has a minor foreigner who is actually accommodated in the Special Home for Temporary Accommodation of Foreigners at the Migration Directorate of the Ministry of Interior (SHTAF) a legal interest to appeal the accommodation order of an adult foreigner in the SHTAF, recorded as his companion? If the answer to this question is negative, should it nevertheless be considered that a legal interest arises in cases when the minor disputes his/her companionship and relationship with the adult foreigner in whose order he/she is registered by the issuing administrative body? If the answers to the above two questions are negative, what is the procedure for protection of the minor against actual placement in SHTAF?;
- 2. In applying Article 44, paragraph 9 of the Foreigners in the Republic of Bulgaria Act (FRBA) is it the burden of the administrative body to establish what the specific relationship is according to the legal definition of paragraph 1, item 4 of the Additional Provisions of the Asylum and Refugees Act between a minor and an adult foreigner designated by the authority as his companion? Is the report of the police body an official document within the meaning of Article 179 of the Civil Procedure Code (CPC) in connection with Article 144 of the Administrative Procedure Code (APC), in order to have a binding probative force in relation to the allegations of a relationship between the adult foreigner and the minor?
- Interpretative case No. 1/2019 was initiated upon the request.
- By virtue of Decision No.3/2021 of the Supreme Administrative Court, the Ombudsman's request was declared inadmissible.