

# **The European Arrest Warrant (EAW) and its Implementation in the Member States of the European Union**

International Research Questionnaire

**Prof. Raimo Lahti  
Sami Kiriakos LL.M.  
(Finland)**

## **1. Constitutional issues**

- a. Please specify views of doctrine and judicature in your country concerning the legal character of the third pillar framework decisions ( further FD) issued on the basis of art. 34.2 TUE**

There is one recent precedent of the Finnish Supreme Court (see below point e. on the matter). As to the Finnish doctrine, the ruling of the judgment of the ECJ in Case C-105/03 *Pupino* that “[t]he national court is required to take into consideration all the rules of national law and to interpret them, so far as possible, in the light of the wording and purpose of the Framework Decision” has been accepted e.g. by J. Salminen, Comment on ECJ Case C-105/03 *Pupino*, in: *Lakimies* 2006, p. 286–299.

- b. Please indicate the position of the doctrine and courts in your country concerning the relation between the domestic norms being a result of implementation of framework decisions – and conventions on European cooperation in criminal matters, accepted within the EU/Council of Europe?**

Finland applies the “dualist” approach with respect to international conventions, *i.e.* after signing the convention must be transferred into the national legal system with a separate Act of Parliament in order for it to have legal force within Finland. In principle there is no difference in legal effects between national norms resulting from a FD and the introductory acts of international conventions when the hierarchy of the norms is the same (*e.g.* both are Acts of Parliament).

See also below point e.

- c. Is the doctrine and judicature in your country opting for “pro-european” (“European – friendly”), interpretation of domestic law, including constitutional law? Is it also applied as regards third pillar instruments?**

Generally, yes. As to the doctrine, see e.g. J. Raitio: *Eurooppaoikeus ja sisämarkkinat* (European Law and Internal Market), Helsinki 2006, p. 199–203; T. Ojanen: *EU-oikeuden perusteita* (Fundamentals of the EU-Law), Helsinki 2006, p. 286–290 (with references to Finnish case-law). As to a recent Finnish precedent, see below point e.

- d. What is the influence of European Court of Justice (further: ECJ) judicial decisions on the implementation of domestic law (e.g. *Pupino* case)?**

When applying “pro-european” interpretation of domestic law, judicature may have references to ECJ-decisions. See *i.a.* the Finnish precedent explained below under point e.

- e. Is interpretation of domestic law implementing framework decisions in your country possible solely by referring to the wording or inhalt of the framework decisions? Is it possible also when a FD is not yet implemented into the domestic legal order?**

In a recent EAW-case the Finnish Supreme Court (2005:139) relied on the EAW Framework Decision to interpret the terms in the Finnish implementing law. The case concerned an EAW issued by Sweden concerning a Finnish national who had fled to Finland after having been sentenced to long-term psychiatric treatment in custody (*rättspsykiatrisk vård*) by a Swedish Court in a criminal trial.

The Supreme Court was faced with the question whether psychiatric treatment in custody could qualify as a “custodial sentence”, *i.e.* as a valid basis of an EAW. The court of first instance had cancelled out this possibility referring to the terminology in the Finnish implementing law which seemed to have a more limited scope than the corresponding terms “a custodial sentence or detention order” in Article 1(1) of the FD. The Supreme Court, on the other hand, referred to the *Pupino* case (C-105/03) and acknowledged that national law should be interpreted as far as possible in line with the wording and purpose of the FD.

The Court concluded that the Swedish EAW concerned a custodial sentence as it was meant in Article 1(1) of the FD and that Finnish law had to be interpreted in the same way. Thus, the EAW in question was regarded as falling into the scope of the EAW-system. In the current case, however, the fact that the requested person was a Finnish citizen and had asked to serve his sentence in Finland obliged barred the execution of the EAW (see also point 2.a. below).

It is worth noting that the Supreme Court did not rely on the FD solely but as a factor of a “pro-european” interpretation: “national law should be interpreted as far as possible in line with the wording and purpose of the FD”.

There is no Finnish case-law in interpreting domestic law in the light of a FD that is not yet implemented. In Finnish doctrine has been emphasized that an EC directive or an EU FD cannot, if not implemented in national law, entail direct effect or interpreting effect against the interest of an individual. The discretionary power of the authorities is restricted by the profound principles such as the legality principle (*nullum crimen sine lege*) and the principle of legal certainty. See T. Pöysti: *Tehokkuus, informaatio ja eurooppalainen oikeusalue* (Efficiency, information and the European legal space). Helsinki 1999, p. 281.

- f. To what scope, if at all, is it possible to ask EJC preliminary questions as refers to the interpretation of framework decisions (art. 35 of the treaty of the European Union, TUE). Can such question be asked by constitutional court (or equivalent)?**

Finland has declared that all of its courts may make references to the ECJ on the interpretation or validity of third pillar instruments in accordance with TEU Article 35.

- g. What is the technical form of implementation of the framework decision on EAW in your country (e.g. separate law, a part of the Code of Criminal Procedure, separate from extradition provisions, other ways)? When exactly did the law implementing the framework decision enter into force?**

The FD was implemented by enacting a separate law, the Act on Extradition On the Basis of an Offence Between Finland and Other Member States of the European Union (“The EU Extradition Act”; an unofficial translation by the Ministry of Justice is available at: <http://www.finlex.fi/laki/kaannokset/2003/en20031286.pdf>), and by making some minor changes to other legislation. The implementing legislation entered into force on 1 January 2004.

- h. Was the implementation the framework decision and the FD itself subject of proceedings of the Constitutional Court in your country?**

Finland does not have a Constitutional Court. The Constitutional Law Committee (*perustuslakivaliokunta*) of the Parliament is generally regarded as highest authority interpreting the Constitution. The Committee was involved during the negotiations of the FD and its subsequent implementation process (*i.e.* when the Government proposal for the EU Extradition Act was under reading at the Parliament).

The Committee mostly scrutinized whether the proposed EAW regulation was in conformity with the provision in the Finnish Constitution which prohibits the extradition of a Finnish citizen against his will. It acknowledged that it was already possible to a limited extent to extradite Finns against their will to other Nordic and EU countries and that the Constitution did not fully correspond to the current practice. It also took into account that in the EAW system a custodial sentence would have to be carried out in Finland if the person concerned so requested (*see below points 2.a. and 5.m.*). Then again, the Committee noted that the partial abandoning of the double criminality requirement in the EAW system would considerably loosen up the preconditions for extraditing a citizen.

Consequently, the Committee took the view that the proposed EAW implementing Act would partially breach the Constitution, yet it could be passed by using the special procedure for quickened constitutional enactment. According to Section 95 (2) of the Constitution of Finland (731/1999),: “if the proposal concerns the Constitution..., the Parliament shall adopt it, without leaving it in abeyance, by a decision supported by at least two thirds of the votes cast”. This flexibility of the Constitution enables the bringing into force of international obligations that are in their substance contrary to the Constitution – without amending the Constitution itself. The Parliament eventually used this procedure.

The Parliament has recently passed an amendment to the Constitution according to which a Finnish national can be extradited against his will to a country where his human rights and due process of law is guaranteed. The amendment enters into force after it has been confirmed by the next elected Parliament.

- i. Is the surrender procedure according to the EAW understood as a form of extradition or is it treated as a separate legal instrument?**

The Government's view, expressed in the *travaux préparatoires*, was that despite the new terminology the EAW essentially concerns extradition. This idea remained in the main implementing Act, the "EU Extradition Act", which uses traditional terminology such as 'extradition' and 'request for extradition' (though one should note that in the Finnish language it is difficult to find different translations for the terms 'surrender' and 'extradition'). Nonetheless, due to the new principles and procedures in the EAW system, "extradition" between EU Member States was regulated in a separate Act.

This solution has also been criticized in the Finnish doctrine; see J. Sihto: Den europeiska arresteringsordern (The European arrest warrant). Tidskrift utgiven Juridiska Föreningen i Finland 2003, p. 502–531, 530.

## **2. The implementation of the FD on the EAW in the domestic legal order**

**a. Are there differences between the way of implementation of the EAW in your country and the "pattern" provided by the framework decision? If so, do the differences concern:**

**- the negative premises (compulsorily and optional) of surrender?**

The EU Extradition Act contains a Section for mandatory grounds for non-execution and a Section for optional grounds for non-execution, as in Articles 3 and 4 of the FD. There are certain differences however.

When the EAW has been issued for the purposes of execution of a custodial sentence or detention order and the person concerned is a Finnish national and asks to serve his sentence in Finland, the competent authority (Court) is obliged to refuse the execution of the EAW. See the EU Extradition Act, Ch. 2, Sec. 5 (1.4). According to the similar provision in Article 4(6) of the FD the refusal is optional.

There is another mandatory ground for refusal which in the FD is optional. The execution of the EAW must be refused when the act which constitutes the offence is deemed to have been committed in full or in part in Finland or on a Finnish vessel or in a Finnish aircraft and (a) the act or the corresponding act is not punishable in Finland, or (b) the right to bring charges, according to the law of Finland, has become time-barred or punishment may no longer be imposed or enforced. See The EU Extradition Act, Ch. 2, Sec. 5 (1.5); cf. Article 4(7a) of the FD.

There are also two mandatory grounds for refusal which are not included in Articles 3 or 4 of the FD:

a) There is justifiable ground to suspect that the requested person is threatened by capital punishment, torture or other degrading treatment or that he would be subjected, on the basis of origin, membership in a certain social group, religion, belief or political opinion, to persecution that threatens his life or liberty or to other persecution, or there is justifiable cause to assume that he would be subjected to a violation of his human rights or constitutionally protected due process, freedom of speech or freedom of association. (The EU Extradition Act, Ch. 2, Sec. 5 (1.6).)

b) The execution of the EAW, in view of the age, state of health or other personal circumstances or special circumstances of the person in question would be unreasonable on humanitarian grounds and this unreasonableness cannot be avoided by postponing the execution. (The EU Extradition Act, Ch. 2, Sec. 5 (2).)

These provisions are, according to the *travaux préparatoires*, are justified on the basis of the recitals 12 and 13 and Article 1(3) of the FD.

- **the catalogue of “crimes” listed in art. 2.2. FD. Are all those “crimes” criminalised in your country. Please specify which are not criminalized?**

Roughly, all of the crimes in the list are found in Finnish law.

- **the period of time for execution of the EAW?**

The time limits are slightly more rigid than in the FD. If the requested person has consented to the surrender, the district court (i.e. the executing judicial authority) must decide on the execution of the EAW within three days after the consent has been given. In any case the court must decide on the question within 26 days after the requested person has been apprehended or otherwise found in Finland. However, if for a special reason the decision cannot be taken within the said time limits, it must be taken as soon as possible. See The EU Extradition Act, Ch. 2, Sec. 32.

- **other issues. Please specify.**

- b. Can lack of dual criminality in cases other than mentioned in art. 2.2. FD constitute optional reason to refuse the execution of the EAW (to surrender)?**

Lack of dual criminality always bars the execution of the EAW in cases other than those referred to in Article 2(2). See The EU Extradition Act, Ch. 2, Sections 2–3.

- c. Did your country make a proper notification to the Secretary of the CUE, concerning the waiver of the specialty rule (according to the art. 27.1 FD)?**

Finland made the following statement:

*“In Finland, consent to surrender and, where appropriate, express renunciation of entitlement to the specialty rule referred to in Article 27(2) may be revoked. Consent may be revoked in accordance with domestic law until surrender has been executed.”*

- d. Did your country appoint a central authority (art. 7 FD). If so, which one? What is the scope and tasks it is supposed to perform and its practical meaning?**

Pursuant to Article 7 FD Finland has appointed as central authorities the Ministry of Justice and the SIRENE Office at the National Bureau of Investigation (*Keskusrikospoliisi*).

The SIRENE Office is the competent authority for receiving EAWs and forwarding them to the competent prosecutors. EAWs may also be sent directly to the competent prosecutor.

The Ministry of Justice acts as a central authority which may be contacted with questions concerning the EAW. In case the abovementioned means of sending an EAW to Finland are inappropriate, the EAWs may be sent to the Ministry which forwards them to the competent prosecutor.

### **3. The principle *ne bis in idem* and EAW**

- a. What is the meaning of the identity of an act in the context of the art. 3 FD (ground for refusal of the execution of EAW) – is it its description or legal qualification as made by the domestic court?**

The district court has to decide whether the concrete, historical event for which the person concerned has already been judged is the same as the one on which the EAW is based. The legal qualification of the events is not decisive. See in more detail on the Finnish doctrine and case-law, R. Lahti: Finland; Concurrent National and International Criminal Jurisdiction and the Principle of *ne bis in idem*. *Revue Internationale de Droit Pénal* (RIDP), Vol. 73, 2002, p. 901–911, 903.

- b. Is the valid judgement/conviction/discontinuance of the procedure in your country a mandatory ground for non – execution of the EAW?**

A valid (legally final) judgment by a court in Finland or in another EU Member State is a mandatory ground for non-execution. An additional prerequisite is provided in the case when the person has been sentenced to punishment: the person must have served or must serve the sentence or, in accordance with the law of the of the Member State that has sentenced the person, the sentence may no longer be enforced. (The EU Extradition Act, Ch. 2, Sec. 5(1.2))

Grounds for optional refusal include: (a) a decision taken in Finland not to prosecute for the offence on which the EAW is based or an abandonment of prosecution that has been initiated; (b) a final decision taken in a Member State other than a judgment which prevents the bringing of charges; (c) The requested person has been finally judged in a state other than a EU Member State or by the International Criminal Court in respect of the act on which the request is based provided that where he or she has been sentenced, the sentence has been served or is currently being served or may no longer be executed under the law of the sentencing country. (The EU Extradition Act, Ch. 2, Sec. 6 (1.2–3; 1.7).)

- c. Is the valid judgement/conviction/discontinuance of the procedure in other UE Member State the same ground for refusal as in “b”?**

See above point b.

- d. What is the meaning and/or interpretation of “the finally disposal of the trial” in art. 54 Schengen Treaty in your country?**

There is no case-law on this question. However, it is probable that the case-law of the European Courts in Strasbourg and Luxembourg will have harmonizing effects at the national level. In the Communication of the Government on the draft FD on the

application of the “*ne bis in idem*” (13 February 2003) it was stated *i.a.* that “any decision which as the status of *res judicata* under national law should be considered a final judgment, such as an extrajudicial mediated settlement in a criminal matter”.

- **Is such a disposal the valid decision on discontinuance of the criminal process because its legal inadmissibility?**

.....

- **Is such a disposal the valid decision on discontinuance of the criminal process because lack of advisability of prosecution?**

.....

- e. **Was the problem of the European application of the principle *ne bis in idem* a subject of judicial interpretation in your country (e.g. by the Supreme Court, Constitutional Court)?**

So far there are no court decisions in which a reference to the case-law of the European courts had been made, but the judicial practice has been substantially in line with that practice. See e.g. R. Lahti, RIDP 2002 p. 909–910 and P. Koponen: Talousrikokset rikos- ja prosessioikeuden yhtymäkohdassa (Economic crime in the point of convergence of criminal and procedural law). Helsinki 2004, p. 62–66.

#### **4. The issuing of the EAW**

- a. **Which judicial authority in your country decides on the issuing of the EAW?**

The EAW for prosecution is made by the public prosecutor who is competent to bring charges in the criminal case in question. The EAW for enforcement of a custodial sentence is made by the Criminal Sanctions Agency.

- b. **Is, according to the domestic law, the decision on issuing of the EAW made on a motion (on request) of a national organ or ex officio. If the former, on which organ’s motion/request?**

The decision is made by the issuing authority *ex officio*.

- c. **If a court is entitled to issue the EAW – of what rank and panel?**

N/A

- d. **Do the parties or other participants to the process have the right or duty to take part in the session?**

The process of issuing an EAW does not involve a session in which the parties or other participants could take part.

- e. **Is evidence procedure made in the proceedings on the issuing of the EAW?**

The prosecutor evaluates the evidence gathered by the investigative authority (usually the police) when taking the decision whether to issue an EAW.

- f. Who (party, other participant), if anyone, is entitled to appeal against the decision on the issuing (accordingly: rejecting issuing) of the EAW? Which judicial authority reviews these decisions?**

No special procedure exists for appealing against the issuing of the EAW.

- g. Can the EAW be issued retroactively? (as regards to crimes allegedly committed before the implementation of the EAW)?**

The EAW can be issued for crimes committed before the implementation of the EAW, *i.e.* 1 January 2004. However, if another Member State has given notice that as the requested Member State it applies the provisions in force before the legislation on implementation of the FD to acts committed before a date that it specifies, also Finland as the requesting Member State applies the law in force before the EAW.

- h. How many EAWs were issued in your country until the day mentioned above in point 1g of the questionnaire?**

(a) EAWs issued by prosecutors (for prosecution):

Year  
2004: 75  
2005: 58  
2006: 44 (by 31 October)

Total: 177

(b) EAWs issued by the Criminal Sanctions Agency (for the enforcement of a custodial sentence):

Year  
2004: 24  
2005: 15  
2006: 11 (by 31 October)

Total: 50

- i. Which “crimes” mentioned in art. 2.2. of the FD on EAW were subject to issuing the EAW in your country? If possible, please specify exact numbers?**

-  
.....

- j. Were the EAW’s issued in your country subject to crimes other than “crimes” mentioned in art. 2.2. FD. If so, in how many cases?**

-  
.....

- k. How many such request were rejected by the deciding judicial authority? (applies only if EAW’s are issued on request)?**

-  
.....

- l. Which information channels are used before/along with the issuing of the EAW in your country (SIS, EJN, Europol, other means)? Is EAW issued only if the exact place of residence of the requested person is known? If not, what is the procedure if the place of residence of the requested person is not known?**

SIS, EJN, Europol, Eurojust and Interpol are all valid channels. When the location of the person concerned is known, the competent authority may issue the EAW directly or through international channels of communication to the competent authority of another Member State. When the location is unknown, the EAW is entered into the SIS and the Interpol information system.

- m. How many EAW's issued by the judicial authority in your country were executed in other Member States? In how many cases was the requested person effectively surrendered**

Persons apprehended/effectively surrendered to Finland:

Year  
2004: 46/34  
2005: 55/38  
2006: 30/19 (by 31 October)

- n. In how many cases did the executing of the EAW issued by judicial authority in your country refuse? What were the grounds for refusal?**

.....

## **5. Executing of the European Arrest Warrant**

- a. Which judicial authority in your country decides on executing of the EAW?**

The district courts (courts of first instance) of Helsinki, Kuopio, Oulu and Tampere. The district court is competent to decide on the matter when it consists of the chairman alone without the panel of lay judges. The decision of the district court is subject to appeal to the Supreme Court.

- b. Is the decision on execution of the EAW performed ex officio or on request of other domestic judicial authority. If yes – what is that judicial authority?**

The district court decides on the execution of the EAW on the request of the public prosecutor.

- c. Does your domestic law envisage a period in which the decision on the execution of the EAW should be made? If so, what is that period of time?**

See point 2.a.

**d. Can the judicial authority deciding upon the execution of the EAW verify the information provided in the EAW? Can it perform evidence?**

The district court does not perform a verification of the EAW. Still, the district court must make sure that the matter is thoroughly examined before deciding on the execution of the EAW. The district court may, when finding it necessary, before taking the decision, request supplementary information from the competent authority of the requesting Member State. The court may set a time limit for receipt of the information. The requested person must be heard on the information received.

If the prosecutor, before taking the case to the district court, finds that information in the EAW is inadequate, he should ask for additional data from the issuing judicial authority in the other Member State. It is also stated in the EU Extradition Act (Ch. 2, Sec. 28 (1)) that the prosecutor should safeguard the interests of the issuing Member State in the district court session.

**e. How, if at all, does your domestic law regulate the solution of the concurrent EAWs?**

In the case of multiple EAWs, the court must at the same time as deciding on the execution decide also to which Member State the person is to be surrendered. The court must give consideration to all the relevant circumstances, especially the type and place of commission of the offences on which the EAWs are based, when the requests were made and whether the request is made for the purposes of prosecution or for the execution of a custodial sentence. If the requests refer to different offences, the court may order that the person surrendered to a certain Member State shall be subsequently surrendered to another Member State in accordance with the conditions of the EU Extradition Act. (The EU Extradition Act, Ch. 2, Sec. 34 (1–2).)

**f. Does the domestic law in your country envisage the collision of an EAW and extradition procedure? If so, please clarify.**

If both a Member State and a State that is not a Member State of the European Union or a Nordic country requests the surrender/extradition of the same person and both requests satisfy the conditions for surrender/extradition it is for the Ministry of Justice to decide which request (*i.e.* whether the EAW or the extradition request) takes precedence. Requests for surrender to the ICC should be given precedence. (The EU Extradition Act, Ch. 2, Sec. 34 (3–4).)

**g. Is the EAW issued in other Member State of the EU a sole legal basis for the deprivation of liberty for the sake of procedure of execution of the EAW, or is a separate judicial authority decision on arrest (provisional arrest) required?**

A person may be apprehended by the police for the purpose of ensuring the execution of the EAW. After the person concerned is first apprehended the prolongation of the deprivation of liberty should be referred within 4 days to the district court. See the EU Extradition Act, Ch. 2, Secs. 16–19.

According to the *travaux préparatoires* of the EU Extradition Act, if the EAW exceptionally would clearly seem ill-founded, the deprivation of liberty should not be carried out or upheld.

**h. What is the maximum period for the arrest of the requested person before his or her effective surrender?**

The general rules on the duration of deprivation of liberty in pre-trial stage in the Coercive Measures Act (450/1987) also apply to the EAW procedure. There is no maximum period defined but the grounds for the deprivation of liberty (*e.g.* risk of escape) are reviewed every two weeks if the detained person so requests. The law also contains a prohibition of excessive or disproportionate deprivation of liberty. In practice, the EAWs have usually been executed quite speedily after the requested person has been detained.

**i. What rank – and panel – of the court decides on surrender (the execution of the EAW)?**

See point a above.

**j. Do parties or other participants of the proceedings have the right or duty to take part in the session?**

The prosecutor and the requested person must be present at the session. Other participants are not allowed to take part. The session and the relevant documents are not public.

**k. Can the decision on surrender be complained. Who has the right to complain? Which judicial authority reviews this decision?**

The decision of the district court is subject to appeal to the Supreme Court without a request for leave of appeal. Both the prosecutor and the requested person may appeal.

**l. Does the person in question have the right to:**

- **the assistance by the defense lawyer?**

Yes.

- **the right to interpreter?**

Yes.

**m. Does the domestic law in your country envisage any barriers as refers to the surrender of own nationals?**

See point 2.a.

Also, if a Finnish citizen has requested in connection with the consideration of the execution of the EAW for prosecution that he be allowed to serve the sentence in Finland, the execution of the EAW is subject to the condition that he is returned to Finland immediately after the judgment becomes final in order to serve the possible custodial sentence imposed on him. (The EU Extradition Act, Ch. 2, Sec. 8 (1).)

- n. How many EAWs issued by other Member State (MS) was executed by your country from the date mentioned in 1g of the questionnaire. In how many cases was the person effectively surrendered?**

Persons caught in Finland on the basis of an EAW:

Year

2004: 4

2005: 10

2006: 8 (by 31 October)

- o. In how many cases did judicial authority in your country refuse to execute the EAW. What were the grounds for non – execution?**

There are no such cases.

- p. For what “crimes” listed in art. 2.2 of the FD were EAWs executed in your country. If possible, please specify by providing exact numbers.**

.....

- q. Was the EAW executed for crimes other than listed in the above mentioned art. 2.2. FD? If so, in how many cases?**

.....

- r. Were there cases in your country, in which courts rejected the executing of the EAW because of possible violation of quaranties of the requested person in the country of issuing of the EAW (esp. human rights)?**

N/A

- s. How often does the requested person consent to the “fast track” surrender procedure?**

.....

- t. In how many cases was the decision on the execution of the EAW subject of the judicial control? What were the results of such control? In how many cases was the decision on the execution of the EAW revoked?**

.....

- u. What is the average period of time between the execution of the EAW and the effective surrender of the requested person?**

In cases where the person has agreed to the surrender: 17 days (time between the arrest and the decision on the surrender).

In cases where the person has not agreed to the surrender: 37 days (time between the arrest and the decision on the surrender).

## 6. Others

- a. **Are there any special difficulties in putting the EAW into practice, resulting from particularities of legal system in your country (esp. common law countries)?**

Traditionally, various ways and means of Nordic cooperation have been developed in Scandinavia, among them unified laws on extradition between the Nordic countries since the 1960s. These laws have enabled a more efficient extradition practice than other means. In the *travaux préparatoires* of the Finnish EU Extradition Act it was expressed that this smoother cooperation should be continued between Finland, Denmark and Sweden in those cases where the objectives of the FD on EAW would be extended or enlarged and the procedures for surrender of persons simplified or facilitated further. In fact, the EU Extradition Act and similar national laws for implementing the FD on EAW have been applied also between Finland, Denmark and Sweden. In order to create a unified extradition instrument between all the Nordic countries a convention on the extradition between the Nordic countries (Nordic arrest warrant) was signed on 15 December 2005, and this convention should be ratified by the end of 2007. After that this convention and the national laws implementing it would be applied in extraditions between the Nordic countries exclusively.