

2021 Rule of Law Report - targeted stakeholder consultation

Fields marked with * are mandatory.

Introduction

The first annual Rule of Law Report was published on 30 September 2020. It is the core of the new European rule of law mechanism, which acts as a preventive tool, deepening multilateral dialogue and joint awareness of rule of law issues.

In the preparation of the first annual Rule of Law Report, the Commission relied on a diversity of relevant sources, including from Member States, country visits, and stakeholders' contributions collected through a targeted stakeholder consultation[1]. The information provided has informed the Member State-specific assessments of the Commission in preparing the Report. Building on the positive experience from the first Rule of Law Report, the Commission is inviting stakeholders to provide written contributions for the preparation of the 2021 Rule of Law Report through this targeted consultation.

The contributions should cover in particular (1) feedback and developments with regard to the points raised in the country chapters of the 2020 Rule of Law Report and (2) any other significant developments since January 2020[2] falling under the 'type of information' outlined in next section. This would also include significant rule of law developments in relation to the COVID-19 pandemic falling under the scope of the four pillars covered by the report.

The input should be short and concise, if possible in English, and summarise information related to one or more of the areas referred to in the template. You are invited to focus on the areas that relate to the scope of work and expertise of your organisation. Existing reports, statements, legislation or other documents may be referenced with a link (no need to provide the full text). Stakeholders are encouraged to make references to any contributions already provided in a different context or to Reports and documents already published.

Contributions should focus on significant developments both as regards the legal framework and its implementation in practice.

Please provide your contribution by 8 March. Should you have any requests for clarifications, you can contact the Commission at the following email address: rule-of-law-network@ec.europa.eu.

[1] https://ec.europa.eu/info/publications/2020-rule-law-report-targeted-stakeholder-consultation_en

[2] Unless the information was already submitted in the consultation for the 2020 Rule of Law Report.

Type of information

The topics are structured according to four pillars: I. Justice system; II. Anti-corruption framework; III. Media pluralism; and IV. Other institutional issues related to checks and balances. The replies could include aspects set out below under each pillar. This can include challenges, current work streams, positive developments and best practices:

Legislative developments

- Newly adopted legislation
- Legislative drafts currently discussed in Parliament
- Legislative plans envisaged by the Government

Policy developments

- Implementation of legislation
- Evaluations, impact assessment, surveys
- White papers/strategies/actions plans/consultation processes
- Follow-up to reports/recommendations of Council of Europe bodies or other international organisations
- Important administrative measures
- Generalised practices

Developments related to the judiciary / independent authorities

- Important case law by national courts
- Important decision/opinions from independent bodies/authorities
- State of play on terms and nominations for high-level positions (e.g. Supreme Court, Constitutional Court, Council for the Judiciary, heads of independent authorities included in the scope of the request for input[1])

Any other relevant developments

- National authorities are free to add any further information, which they deem relevant; however, this should be short and to the point.

Please include, where relevant, information related to measures taken in the context of the COVID-19 pandemic under the relevant topics.

If there are no changes, it is sufficient to indicate this and the information covered in the 2020 Rule of Law Report should not be repeated.

[1] Such as: media regulatory authorities and bodies, national human rights institutions, equality bodies, ombudsman institutions and supreme audit institutions.

About you

* I am giving my contribution as

Civil society organisation/NGO

* Organisation name

250 character(s) maximum

Civic Platform for Judicial Independenc

* Main Areas of Work

- ☒ Justice System
- ☐ Anti-corruption
- ☐ Media Pluralism
- ☐ Other

* Please insert an URL towards your organisation's main online presence or describe your organisation briefly:

500 character(s) maximum

Association formed by legal scholars and civil society professionals concerned about the politicization of the Spanish justice system. Its sole objective is the defence of the Rule of Law and the independence of the Judiciary, in accordance with European and international standards.
It is a pioneer in denouncing attacks on judicial independence in Spain before international and European bodies. Its latest report compiles the attacks of the political power against Justice.

Transparency register number

Check if your organisation is in the transparency register. It's a voluntary database for organisations seeking to influence EU decision-making

* Country of origin

Please add the country of origin of your organisation

Spain

* First Name

Civic Platform for Judicial Independence

* Surname

Civic Platform for Judicial Independence

* Email Address of the organisation (this information will not be published)

* Publication of your contribution and privacy settings

You can choose whether you wish for your contribution to be published and whether you wish your details to be made public or to remain anonymous.

- ☐ Anonymous - Only your type of respondent, country of origin and contribution will be published. Organisation name, URL, transparency register number, first name and surname given above will not be published. **To maintain anonymity, please refrain from mentioning the name of your organisation and any details from which your organisation can be identified in the rest of your contribution.**
- ☒ Public - Your personal details (name, organisation name, transparency register number, country of origin) will be published with your contribution.
- ☐ No publication - Your contribution will not be published. Elements of your contribution may be referred to anonymously in documents produced by the Commission based on this consultation.

☒ I agree with the [personal data protection provisions](#).

Questions on horizontal developments

In this section, you are invited to provide information on general horizontal developments or trends, both positive and negative, covering all or several Member States. In particular, you could mention issues that are common to several Member States, as well as best practices identified in one Member State that could be replicated. Moreover, you could refer to your activities in the area of the four pillars and sub-topics (an overview of all sub-topics can be found below), and, if you represent a Network of national organisations, to the support you might have provided to one of your national members.

Overview topics for contribution

[overview topics for contribution.pdf](#)

Please provide any relevant information on horizontal developments here

5000 character(s) maximum

1.- Spain is in a serious and anomalous situation in terms of judicial independence. Poland and Spain are the only two countries in the entire Union where the appointment of all the members of their Councils of Justice, which are subsequently responsible for the appointment of the highest judicial bodies, is not subject to the same conditions, are in hands of Parliament and, in practice, depending on political parties.

Numerous recommendations issued by the Council of Europe, specifically from the “Group of States Against Corruption” (GRECO), urge the Spanish State to modify the system of election of 12 of the 20 members of the General Council of the Judiciary, so that the political authorities do not intervene in any phase of their appointment.

Spain's flagrant failure to comply with European rules on judicial independence is even more evident in the light of the latest rulings of the CJEU in the various infringement proceedings against Poland [judgment of 24 June 2019, Commission v Poland C-619/18, EU: C: 2019:531, paragraph 58 and judgment of the CJEU of 19 November 2019, C-585-18).

2.- We alert the institutions of the European Union to the processing in Spain of a whole series of structural legislative reforms that will represent a real assault on the independence of the Spanish Judiciary by the Executive branch of the Regime. All these legislative reforms are being processed as a matter of urgency.

In order to speed up the process, the mandatory hearing process that must be granted to all the sectors involved (CGPJ, European Commission for Democracy through Law [Venice Commission-Council of Europe], judicial associations, prosecutors, unions of the Administration of Justice, Autonomous Communities) has been dispensed with. Such prior hearing procedure is mandatory, as expressly indicated in the case law of the CJEU and in the recommendations of the European Commission 2017/1520 and 2018 /103.

These reforms affect (i) the manner of appointment of the CGPJ so that 20 out of 20 members are elected by the Parliament by simple majority (which will be of the same political colour as the Government); (ii) the CGPJ with expired mandate so that it cannot appoint Supreme Court judges until it is not renewed by the Parliament; (iii) to the criminal investigation, which is foreseen to be reassigned from judges to the prosecutors, keeping them under the hierarchical dependence of the Government; (iv) to the unipersonal judges, because the Courts of Instance are created and all of them depend on a president appointed by the CGPJ, which is the projection of the Parliament (or Government).

3. - The intervention of the European institutions is urgent, necessary and indispensable.

<https://plataformaindependenciaindicial.es/2021/02/07/complaint-of-the-platform-addressed-to-the-european-union/>

Questions on developments in Member States

The following four pillars are sub-divided into topics and sub-topics. You are invited to provide concrete information on significant developments, focusing primarily on developments since January 2020, for each of the sub-topics which are relevant for your work. Please feel free to provide a link to and reference relevant legislation/documents. Significant developments can include challenges, positive developments and best practices, covering both legislative developments or implementation and practices (as outlined under “type of information”).

If there are developments you consider relevant under each of the four pillars that are not mentioned in the sub-topics, please add them under the section "other - please specify". Only significant developments should be covered.

Please note that, due to the size of the questionnaire, certain elements may be slow to load, especially if selecting many Member States at once. In such cases, it is recommended to wait a few minutes to let the page load correctly.

Member States covered in contribution [several choices possible]

Please select all Member States for which you wish to contribute information. For each Member State, a separate template for providing information will open. This may take several minutes to fully load.

- ☐ Austria
- ☐ Belgium
- ☐ Bulgaria
- ☐ Croatia
- ☐ Cyprus
- ☐ Czechia
- ☐ Denmark
- ☐ Estonia
- ☐ Finland
- ☐ France
- ☐ Germany
- ☐ Greece
- ☐ Hungary
- ☐ Ireland
- ☐ Italy
- ☐ Latvia
- ☐ Lithuania
- ☐ Luxembourg
- ☐ Malta
- ☐ Netherlands
- ☐ Poland
- ☐ Portugal
- ☐ Romania
- ☐ Slovak Republic
- ☐ Slovenia
- ☒ Spain
- ☐ Sweden

Justice System - Spain

Independence

Appointment and selection of judges, prosecutors and court presidents

(The reference to 'judges' concerns judges at all level and types of courts as well as judges at constitutional courts)

3000 character(s) maximum

1. The CGPJ (General Council of the Judicial Power) carries out the appointment of the highest levels of the judiciary in Spain, not only of the presidents of the regional High Courts of Justice and their Chambers, of the presidents of the Provincial Courts and of the National High Court and their Chambers, but also of the magistrates of the Supreme Court and of other high-ranking positions in the different services of the CGPJ.
2. The appointment of the judges of the Second Chamber of the Supreme Court is of special importance, since this is the court entitled to investigate and judge criminal cases against members of the Government and members of Parliament, due to the special privileges that they enjoy.
3. The appointment of the judges of the Third Chamber of the Supreme Court, of the contentious-administrative jurisdiction, is also important, since it is competent to judge the acts of both the central and regional governments and, in short, to judge the acts of management of the Government.
4. Discretionary appointments have become a way of rewarding and retaliating the trajectory of judges. It is a source of institutional corruption.
5. "Discretion" becomes "arbitrariness" because it is not the most competent and capable for the position that is chosen, but the most loyal or the most partisan. To this end, the terms and conditions of the call for the position are generic and focus on a personal interview and the defence of a program of action. Something very subjective. The candidate is chosen and then a motivation is created.
6. The GRECO (Groups of States against Corruption), after the reform by Organic Law 4/2018 of Article 326.2. LOPJ and its subsequent regulatory development, continues to denounce that Spain does not comply with the requirement to avoid the appearance of partiality in appointments, since no prior and public rules are established for the appointment of judges according to each class of court.
7. The Platform has prepared reports on these discretionary appointments reaching devastating conclusions.
<https://plataformaindependenciajudicial.es/2020/01/12/nombramiento-sala-3a-ts-informe-del-acuerdo-del-cgpj-de-120919/>
8. Likewise, the Platform has elaborated a basis for the reform of the current regulation of discretionary appointments in order to render them objective <https://plataformaindependenciajudicial.es/2016/07/09/propuesta-al-cgpj-bases-nombramientos-discrecionales/>.

Irremovability of judges; including transfers, dismissal and retirement regime of judges, court presidents and prosecutors

3000 character(s) maximum

The tenure of many of the high judicial positions have a short duration (Presidencies of the autonomous high courts and presidencies of chambers, presidencies of the Provincial Courts, the members of the CGPJ, the magistrates of the Constitutional Court).

This short term of office generates exchanges of favours between high judicial officials and politicians, which is very dangerous for the impartiality of the appointed judges. Re-election depends on majorities and political exchanges, creating a series of dependencies on political power.

It is an exchange of cards between the party in government and the opposition party.

https://www.cope.es/actualidad/espana/noticias/estos-son-los-candidatos-presidir-cgpj-llega-acuerdo-para-renovacion-20201026_963588

The system allows the so-called revolving doors, and favours the emergence of "gowned politicians": judges can move directly from politics to the jurisdictional exercise and vice versa under a reform introduced in 2011 by LO 12 /11 of September 22.

Judges may hold any political office or position of trust in the central or regional government or be deputies and senators, through the regime of special services, which adds up for the purposes of seniority in the judicial career ladder. They can spend 20 or 30 years without passing judgments and then, by virtue of the contacts acquired in politics, they can be promoted to the top of the judicial career through the discretionary appointments made by the CGPJ. For example, the current Minister of Justice, who has not handed down any judicial rulings since 2000 because he is on special services, could be appointed as a Supreme Court judge when he returns to the judicial career.

Secondments. The CGPJ decides when a vacant judicial position is filled not by means of a transfer competition but by means of secondment, which is an opaque competition and not subject to prior or objective rules for choosing the candidate. They are widely used in the Audiencia Nacional and to reward like-minded judges.

<https://www.elmundo.es/espana/2021/01/21/600962bbfdddf79c8b45fc.html>

<https://okdiario.com/espana/lesmes-busca-desesperada-magistrados-mas-antiguos-que-mercedes-alaya-cubrir-plaza-mata-6605220>

Promotion of judges and prosecutors

3000 character(s) maximum

1. The ordinary system of recruitment of judges is the “competitive examination” (knowledge tests) and subsequent Judicial School training in a practical phase. It guarantees the principles of equality, merit and ability. The system ensures a high level of legal preparation and guarantees the independence of judges at the base of the career.

This system greatly facilitates the incorporation of women into the judiciary. They are already a majority in the Judicial Career. In recent years, more than 70% of fresh judges are women.

In the Government Agreements presented by “PSOE” political party and “Unidas Podemos” political party, they propose the modification of this system. They intend that the selection be made on the basis of an opinion or practical test and greater importance is given to the personal interview. An ideological profile of judge can be chosen. This new system implies a politicization of judges from the beginning.

2. The system of discretionary (or handpicked) appointment of high judicial positions causes the division of the judicial career by an invisible horizontal line between the grassroots judges, by opposition, impartial and independent, and the judicial leadership of the high courts, who are in charge of media cases, corruption cases and judicial issues involving high political officials. Their rulings are perceived by citizens as decisions mediatized by spurious interests.

3. Proof that only the best connected, and not the best and most capable, reach the top is the scarce presence of women in the upper echelons of the judicial hierarchy (15%), despite the fact that they represent an increasing proportion (60%). It is also a proof that almost all of those who reach the top are associated with certain Judicial Associations (APM, conservative, and JJyDD, progressive). Certain Associations become a means to let politicians know the degree of loyalty, fidelity or ideological profile.

4. The PCIJ has prepared a report on the relevance of introducing the horizontal career of judges, not only to motivate and stimulate a very hopeless career at the grassroots in the face of the reality that only a few prosper (political judges), but also to promote the improvement and acquisition of new professional skills through performance evaluation. Judges would not have to meddle up to the highest judicial levels to achieve adequate remuneration and recognition of their professional competence and merits.

<https://confi.legal.com/20190420-la-carrera-horizontal-la-solucion-para-el-futuro-de-la-judicatura-espanola/>

<https://plataformaindependenciaindicial.es/2018/02/09/carrera-horizonta-judicial-ii/>

Allocation of cases in courts

3000 character(s) maximum

The entry into force of the new Law of Organizational Efficiency, which provides for the configuration of the so-called Courts of First Instance, establishes a discretionary and politicized appointment of the Presidents of such Courts, which may alter the general rules of allocation of cases.

The judges of each Court of First Instance may be called to a Plenary Session by the President in order to unify criteria; they may be removed from a case and may be assigned specific cases. They would have a sort of hierarchical dependence on the president of the Court of First Instance, who is a judge handpicked by the CGPJ.

The judges would be organized like the current Prosecutor's Office, with a pyramidal and hierarchical structure with instructions given from the top.

Independence (including composition and nomination of its members), and powers of the body tasked with safeguarding the independence of the judiciary (e.g. Council for the Judiciary)

3000 character(s) maximum

1. The spirit of the Spanish Constitution of 1978 was transferred to a 1980 law regulating a mixed system of appointment of the CGPJ: 12 judge members were elected by the judges and 8 jurist members were elected by the Parliament.
 2. The Organic Law of 1985 modified the system: 12 members judges would be elected by the Parliament by a 3/5 majority. Thus, 20 out of 20 are elected by the Parliament.
 3. The Constitutional Court (STC 108/1986) endorsed the system, but warned of the risk that the 12 out of 20 members would be elected not by Parliament but by two political parties (the one that wins the elections and the main opposition party). This would not be constitutional.
 4. What the Constitutional Court said was unconstitutional has been happening in Spain for decades. 20 out of 20 members are elected by two parties in a trading of cards.
 5. Poland and Spain are the only two countries in the entire Union in which the appointment of all the members of their Councils of Justice (which subsequently will be responsible for the appointment of the highest judicial bodies) are appointed entirely by politicians.
 6. Numerous recommendations issued by GRECO urge the Spanish State to modify the system of election of the CGPJ.
 7. A Proposition of Organic Law for the reform of the procedure for the election of the Members of the CGPJ has recently been introduced. The reform modifies the appointment of the twelve judicial members of the CGPJ (12 out of 20), reducing the qualified majority of three-fifths (3/5) of the legislative chambers to the simple requirement of an absolute majority.
- https://www.congreso.es/public_oficiales/L14/CONG/BOCG/B/BOCG-14-B-120-1.PDF#page=1.

Accountability of judges and prosecutors, including disciplinary regime and bodies and ethical rules, judicial immunity and criminal liability of judges

3000 character(s) maximum

1. The independence of Spanish judges is also seriously threatened through the system of disciplinary responsibility, since the disciplinary files of Spanish judges and magistrates are handled by the "Promoter of the Disciplinary Action", chosen by the CGPJ in a totally discretionary manner. The CGPJ can order the initiation or the continuation of the file against its criteria. Resolves the file the Disciplinary Commission of the CGPJ, formed by a majority of vocal judges, but they are elected by politicians, so that Spain is in the same line of non-compliance as the one pointed out by the ECHR judgment of June 21, 2016 in the case Nunes Carvalho v. Portugal.
2. In addition, the Promoter of Disciplinary Action can use the informative proceedings without subject to a time limit to bully judges belligerent with the CGPJ.
3. The CGPJ in turn, in a discretionary manner, appoints all of the judges that make up the 6th Section of the Administrative Chamber of the SC, in charge of reviewing disciplinary sanctions imposed on Spanish judges and magistrates.
4. We find ourselves in the same situation as Poland with regard to the disciplinary liability of judges.

Remuneration/bonuses for judges and prosecutors

3000 character(s) maximum

Independence/autonomy of the prosecution service

3000 character(s) maximum

The Spanish Prosecutor's Office does not have the minimum guarantees of independence and impartiality: the appointment of the State Attorney General is made by the Government. The appointment of the Public Prosecutor's Council and the senior officials of the Prosecutor's Office is made in a discretionary manner, but without objective and regulated criteria.

Superior prosecutors can give orders to hierarchically subordinate prosecutors; they can call a prosecutor to their presence and can give him/her specific instructions and remove them from their positions and replace them with other prosecutors in the handling of cases. Senior prosecutors also have disciplinary powers over their subordinates.

All this implies a strong politicization of the institution, which has worsened in recent times with the appointment of the Minister of Justice as Attorney General of the State, Ms Dolores Delgado. Public opinion and citizens perceive the Prosecutor's Office as an institution strongly linked to the Government.

4. The Draft Bill of the Criminal Procedure Law, approved by the Council of Ministers on November 24, 2020. It involves the complete structural modification of the Spanish criminal procedure. The criminal investigation is attributed to the prosecutors, maintaining its pyramidal structure under the orbit of the State Attorney General appointed by the Government.

-The important thing is not who investigates but how the investigation is performed. It makes no difference whether the investigators are judges or prosecutors. What is important is that the investigating body be independent, impartial and irremovable. An independent criminal investigation subject only to legality is a prerequisite for guaranteeing equality before the law and legal certainty; only in this way can basic fundamental rights be guaranteed.

- These procedural reforms cannot be justified under the pretext of making the criminal investigation more efficient and effective, because very useful reforms can be made to the criminal process to make it more efficient and speedy that would not involve such strong politicization. For example, ensuring the unnecessary repetition of police actions before the judicial authority, restricting the possibility of filing an appeal for reform in actions of mere formality during the investigation, speeding up the preparation of expert reports by increasing the number of Forensic Doctors, expert psychologists, psychosocial teams or expert accountants.

-The reform does not foresee the possibility of challenging the appointment of prosecutors for an investigation in particular, unlike what currently happens with the investigating judge.

5. Criminal investigation cannot be attributed to the Public Prosecutor's Office without having previously reformed its Organic Statute, in order to provide it with the necessary independence and impartiality. However, no legislative reform has been presented for this purpose.

Independence of the Bar (chamber/association of lawyers) and of lawyers

3000 character(s) maximum

Significant developments capable of affecting the perception that the general public has of the independence of the judiciary

3000 character(s) maximum

Public opinion and citizens perceive the Prosecutor's Office as an institution totally dependent on political power. The expressions of the President of the Government, Mr. Pedro Sánchez, in an interview on "Radio Nacional de España" (Public Broadcasting Service) were very unfortunate and went around the country for days:

"-Who does the Prosecutor's Office depend on? -asks Sánchez.

-From the Government," answered the journalist hesitantly.

-Well, that's it," says Sánchez".

https://youtu.be/bbDsPfoE_a4

The leak of a controversial WhatsApp message sent by the senator of the Popular Party, Mr. Ignacio Cosidó, in which he boasted about the agreements reached with the PSOE for the renewal of the CGPJ. Indicating how the magistrates of the Second Chamber of the Supreme Court were going to be controlled. Content of one of the WhatsApp "Controlling the Second Chamber from behind and presiding over the 61st Chamber. It has been a move that I have lived from the front line".

https://elpais.com/politica/2018/11/20/actualidad/1542735737_970930.html

https://www.lasexta.com/noticias/nacional/enorme-malestar-entre-los-jueces-del-supremo-por-el-mensaje-filtrado-de-cosido-es-bochornoso-es-indigno-para-representar-a-la-democracia-video_201811195bf30fdb0cf2265d3006b7f9.html

Revealing confessions of magistrates in charge of the instruction of media cases about the pressures they received from the political powers, in one of the TV programs of maximum audience.

This is how they tried to pressure Judge Castro to abandon the Nóos case: from wanting to buy his son to being locked up in the Zarzuela (Royal Palace).

https://www.lasexta.com/programas/salvados/mejores-momentos/asi-intentaron-presionar-al-juez-castro-para-abandonar-el-caso-noos-de-querer-comprar-a-su-hijo-a-encerronas-de-zarzuela_20210124600ddae56f8ead000182d1cb.html

Judge Torres reveals how he was sent the inspection from the CGPJ I think it was to continue investigating César Alierta.

https://www.lasexta.com/programas/salvados/mejores-momentos/el-juez-torres-desvela-como-le-mandaron-una-inspeccion-desde-el-cgpj-creo-que-fue-por-seguir-investigando-a-cesar-alierta_20210124600ddd3f6f8ead000182d41b.html

The Supreme Court refuses to file the case on the appointment of Dolores Delgado as Attorney General of the State. Doubtful legality of her appointment.

<https://www.vozpopuli.com/espana/tribunal-supremo-dolores-delgado-pp.html>

Quality of justice

(Under this topic, you are not required to give statistical information but should provide input on the type of information outlined under "type of information".)

Accessibility of courts (e.g. court fees, legal aid, language)

3000 character(s) maximum

Faced with the measures adopted in recent years aimed at preventing, limiting or hindering citizens' access to justice (such as, among others, the establishment of court fees in 2012, an excessive amount to appeal to another judicial instance, or the creation of unipersonal bodies to hear abusive clauses, which has led to their collapse), an increasingly citizen-centered administration of justice, accessible and close to the citizen, is necessary.

For this reason:

Any economic barrier that prevents, limits or hinders the citizen's free access to justice must be eliminated. In this sense, and beyond the improvements that may be agreed for access to free legal aid and in terms of the benefits it includes or that court fees for SMEs and NGOs should be eliminated, it should not be forgotten that, being the right to defence and effective judicial protection a fundamental right provided for in the Constitution, legal services provided in relation to such rights should be exempt from VAT (as are medical services, dentists, psychologists, etc..) or, failing that, subject to the reduced VAT rate, at least when the recipient is a natural person (since the latter cannot deduct it, unlike companies) and when it is a question of services in the framework of a judicial process (since then we are dealing with a fundamental right). As for the system of procedural costs, it should be excluded in any case of imposition on the litigant administered in favour of the administration and the consumer who intervenes in his condition as such, given his condition of weaker party, in principle.

- The creation of specialized bodies for the knowledge of certain matters should not lead to their being of uniprovincial scope and distant from the citizen, thus increasing the burdens on the litigant. Specialization yes, but not centralization.

It would be convenient the creation of citizen attention offices in the courts or legal guidance services with agreements with Bar Associations and consumer prosecutors, in order to facilitate access to justice for any citizen and bring justice closer to ordinary matters that affect a generality of people.

- Judicial offices must be designed with universal accessibility criteria, without physical, sensory or cognitive barriers, and judicial decisions must be dictated in a language that is easy and understandable for the defendant. Receiving a ruling in accordance with the cognitive needs of each person means guaranteeing their rights and making decisions as relevant to their lives as who will be their guardian, how they will exercise that guardianship, whether they can vote or not, etc., understandable.

Resources of the judiciary (human/financial/material)

Material resources refer e.g. to court buildings and other facilities.

3000 character(s) maximum

The Administration of Justice is a competence transferred to some Autonomous Communities (Regional Governments). The resources of the courts are unequal in the Autonomous Communities territories and those other courts based in the State territory. Different computer software and applications do not allow interconnectivity in many cases. Spain devotes less than 1% of GDP to Justice. The ratio of judges per inhabitant is 11 judges/100,000 inhabitants, one of the lowest in Europe.

The contraction of economic activity resulting from the global epidemic will bring an avalanche of lawsuits that threatens to collapse the courts. No measures have been taken to increase the ratio of judges per inhabitant.

The Spanish justice system suffers from a lack of personal, material and structural resources necessary to provide an adequate, effective and efficient service. To give some data: according to the report of the CGPJ for 2018, the judicial staff is still deficient in at least 361 judicial units (95 magistrate and 266 judge positions). The European Commission, in the 2018 scoreboard and already in a 2016 report of the European Commission for the Efficiency of Justice (CEPEJ) in which it analysed the judicial systems of the different countries, highlighted that Spain has half the number of judges and prosecutors than the European average (21 judges and 11 prosecutors per 100,000 inhabitants) and, with respect to spending on justice, it is indicated that it is decreasing in Spain and is around €80 per person, between 0.3% and 0.4% of GDP. In 2010, this investment was close to €100 per person and fell to around €80 in 2016. Compared to other European countries, in Germany the expenditure stands at €150/person and in Luxembourg it reaches €200 /person.

Improvements at the level of demarcation and judicial plant (such as the creation of more judges, new bodies such as district or municipal courts), at the organizational and work management level and of the means (such as review and redefinition of functions with reduction of administrative tasks for judges and workload, greater specialization, enforcement courts, etc.), at the technological level (such as substantial improvements in the communications system and its control by an independent CGPJ, digital file, interconnection between the computer systems of the different courts and administrations), at the procedural level (such as the simplification of some processes and reasonableness in the setting of appointments) or the promotion of alternative means such as mediation or arbitration.

Training of justice professionals (including judges, prosecutors, lawyers, court staff)

3000 character(s) maximum

Digitalisation (e.g. use of digital technology, particularly electronic communication tools, within the justice system and with court users, including resilience of justice systems in COVID-19 pandemic)

(Factual information presented in Commission Staff Working Document of 2 December 2020, SWD(2020) 540 final, does not need to be repeated)

3000 character(s) maximum

Use of assessment tools and standards (e.g. ICT systems for case management, court statistics and their transparency, monitoring, evaluation, surveys among court users or legal professionals)

3000 character(s) maximum

Geographical distribution and number of courts/jurisdictions ("judicial map") and their specialization

3000 character(s) maximum

Efficiency of the justice system

(Under this topic, you are not required to give statistical information but should provide input on the type of information outlined under "type of information".)

Length of proceedings

3000 character(s) maximum

The excessive length of proceedings and pendency are due to the lack of judges.

During the months since March 14, 2020 when the state of alarm was declared in Spain, the Executive paralyzed Justice for three months. Furthermore, it has not taken any measures to increase the ratio of judges per inhabitant from 11/100,000 inhabitants to 20/100,000 inhabitants, which represents the European average.

The significant drop in the GDP of the Spanish State will mean an increase in the number of cases entering the Social Courts of more than 100%, of more than 150% in the Contentious-Administrative Courts and in the Commercial Courts of more than 200% in the year 2021-2022. It is necessary to guarantee an adequate functioning of the Commercial Courts, with the objective that many of the companies in insolvency proceedings do not disappear definitively, and thus, in the Council Recommendation of July 20, 2020, file:///C:/Users/73563302X/Downloads/Z00054-00061.pdf, it is expressly established in its point 28 the need to adopt measures to preserve the capacity of the judicial system to efficiently deal with insolvency proceedings.

Other - please specify

3000 character(s) maximum

Anti-Corruption Framework - Spain

The institutional framework capacity to fight against corruption (prevention and investigation / prosecution)

List of relevant authorities (e.g. national agencies, bodies) in charge of prevention detection, investigation and prosecution of corruption. Please indicate the resources allocated to these (the human, financial, legal, and practical resources as relevant).

3000 character(s) maximum

Prevention

Integrity framework including incompatibility rules (e.g.: revolving doors)

3000 character(s) maximum

General transparency of public decision-making (including public access to information such as lobbying, asset disclosure rules and transparency of political party financing)

3000 character(s) maximum

Rules on preventing conflict of interests in the public sector.

3000 character(s) maximum

Measures in place to ensure whistleblower protection and encourage reporting of corruption.

3000 character(s) maximum

List the sectors with high-risks of corruption in your Member State and relevant measures taken/envisaged for preventing corruption and conflict of interest in these sectors. (e.g. public procurement, healthcare, other).

3000 character(s) maximum

Measures taken to address corruption risks in the context of the COVID-19 pandemic

3000 character(s) maximum

Any other relevant measures to prevent corruption in public and private sector.

3000 character(s) maximum

Repressive measures

Criminalisation of corruption and related offences.

3000 character(s) maximum

Data on investigation and application of sanctions for corruption offences (including for legal persons and high level and complex corruption cases) and their transparency, including as regards the implementation of EU funds

3000 character(s) maximum

Potential obstacles to investigation and prosecution of high-level and complex corruption cases(e.g. political immunity regulation).

3000 character(s) maximum

Other – please specify

3000 character(s) maximum

Media Pluralism - Spain

Media authorities and bodies

(Cf. Article 30 of Directive 2018/1808)

Independence, enforcement powers and adequacy of resources of media regulatory authorities and bodies.

3000 character(s) maximum

Conditions and procedures for the appointment and dismissal of the head / members of the collegiate body of media regulatory authorities and bodies

3000 character(s) maximum

Existence and functions of media councils or other self-regulatory bodies

3000 character(s) maximum

Transparency of media ownership and government interference

The transparent allocation of state advertising (including any rules regulating the matter); other safeguards against state / political interference

3000 character(s) maximum

Rules governing transparency of media ownership and public availability of media ownership information

3000 character(s) maximum

Framework for journalists' protection

Rules and practices guaranteeing journalist's independence and safety

3000 character(s) maximum

Law enforcement capacity to ensure journalists' safety and to investigate attacks on journalists

3000 character(s) maximum

Access to information and public documents

3000 character(s) maximum

Lawsuits against journalists (incl. defamation)

3000 character(s) maximum

Other - please specify

3000 character(s) maximum

Other institutional issues related to checks and balances - Spain

The process for preparing and enacting laws

Framework, policy and use of impact assessments, stakeholders'/public consultations (particularly consultation of judiciary on judicial reforms) and transparency and quality of the legislative process

3000 character(s) maximum

Throughout the month of December 2020 and January 2021, the Commissioner of Justice, Mr. Didier Reynders, has been expressly questioned in various meetings with the Spanish Ministers of Justice and Foreign Affairs, as well as by the spokesman for Justice of the European Commission, in which they have expressed the need to obtain prior favourable reports from the Venice Commission to carry out the reforms in process. <https://www.abc.es/espana/abci-bruselas-advierte-politizacion-amenaza-cgpj->

202012100215_noticia.html

The Platform, in view of this flagrant violation of Community law, presented a complaint to the Commission and the European Parliament.

<https://plataformaindependenciaindicial.es/2021/01/14/la-plataforma-acude-a-europa/>

Another legislative reform that does not respect the procedures of transparency and hearing is the Draft Bill of the Organic Law of Organizational Efficiency Measures of the Public Service of Justice, with imminent approval by the Council of Ministers after having passed the public consultation process.

In the public consultation process, which has already been carried out, the draft or positive text was not published, but only a mere explanation of the objectives of the reform, and no public consultation with guarantees was carried out.

<https://confilegal.com/wp-content/uploads/2020/11/Consulta-publica-APLO-Eficiencia-Organizativa-FORMATO.pdf>

Rules and use of fast-track procedures and emergency procedures (for example, the percentage of decisions adopted through emergency/urgent procedure compared to the total number of adopted decisions)

3000 character(s) maximum

The seriousness of the health crisis resulting from the pandemic led the Spanish Government to issue Royal Decree 956/2020, of November 3, extending the state of alarm declared on October 25, 2020 until May 9, 2021, thus limiting in an extraordinary and exceptional way the exercise of the fundamental rights of the Spanish people, as well as the parliamentary activity itself. In this sense, the accountability of the President of the Government is reduced to his appearance before the Parliamentary Chamber every two months. In view of the concurrence of extraordinary circumstances in all the Member States of the European Union, the European Commission has recommended to the national governments not to carry out structural reforms during this period of time.

However, the Spanish Government, acting contrary to the recommendations of the European Commission, has initiated a series of structural legislative reforms of the Administration of Justice and the Judiciary during the state of alarm. This is a far-reaching reform, framed in the so-called "Agenda Justice 2030", which is a real assault on the independence of the Judiciary and the separation of powers, under the excuse of modernizing Justice.

Regime for constitutional review of laws.

3000 character(s) maximum

1. This review of laws is carried out by the Constitutional Court (TC).
2. The TC is composed of 12 members, 4 appointed at the proposal of the Congress by a 3/5 majority; 4 at the proposal of the Senate, with the same majority, two at the proposal of the Government, and two at the proposal of the CGPJ. (art. 159.1. C.E.). Recalling that all the members of the CGPJ are elected by the Parliament.
Thus, all the members of the TC are elected by the Legislative and Executive Power.
In practice, there is a concentration of powers in the political party that forms the Government.
3. The appointment of the magistrates and the President of the TC is not for life but temporary. The term of office of the magistrates of the TC is 9 years and that of the President of the TC is 3 years.
4. The temporary nature of the mandate, together with the totally discretionary appointment by the political groups, affect their impartiality in the exercise of their functions, since their decisions will not be based exclusively on the legal criteria applicable to the case, but there is another series of interests, such as being re-elected again by the political parties to occupy another new high judicial or even political or governmental position.
5. At present, matters of great political importance are pending resolution by the TC. For example, an

appeal of unconstitutionality has been filed against the Royal Decrees of State of Alarm and its extensions. Many of its members and President are running for other high positions.

COVID-19: provide update on significant developments with regard to emergency regimes in the context of the COVID-19 pandemic

- judicial review (including constitutional review) of emergency regimes and measures in the context of COVID-19 pandemic
- oversight by Parliament of emergency regimes and measures in the context of COVID-19 pandemic
- measures taken to ensure the continued activity of Parliament (including possible best practices)

3000 character(s) maximum

Independent authorities

Independence, capacity and powers of national human rights institutions ('NHRIs'), of ombudsman institutions if different from NHRIs, of equality bodies if different from NHRIs and of supreme audit institutions

Cf. the website of the European Court of Auditors: <https://www.eca.europa.eu/en/Pages/SupremeAuditInstitutions.aspx#>

3000 character(s) maximum

Accessibility and judicial review of administrative decisions

Transparency of administrative decisions and sanctions (incl. their publication and rules on collection of related data) and judicial review (incl. scope, suspensive effect)

3000 character(s) maximum

Implementation by the public administration and State institutions of final court decisions

3000 character(s) maximum

The enabling framework for civil society

Measures regarding the framework for civil society organisations (e.g. access to funding, registration rules, measures capable of affecting the public perception of civil society organisations, etc.)

3000 character(s) maximum

Initiatives to foster a rule of law culture

Measures to foster a rule of law culture (e.g. debates in national parliaments on the rule of law, public information campaigns on rule of law issues, etc.)

3000 character(s) maximum

Other – please specify

3000 character(s) maximum

Contact

rule-of-law-network@ec.europa.eu