

IDENTIFYING, HANDLING AND CONSIDERING ASYLUM CLAIMS MADE BY SUSPECTED WAR CRIMINALS AND PERPETRATORS OF CRIMES AGAINST HUMANITY, INCLUDING GENOCIDE

Table of Contents

1. Introduction

1.1 Purpose of Instruction

1.2 Use of Terms

2. Background

3. The War Crimes Team

4. Conducting the Asylum Interview of a Suspected War Criminal

4.1 Forwarding cases to the War Crimes Team

4.2 Post-Interview Analysis

5. Identification of Suspected War Criminals

5.1 Credibility Issues

5.2 Forwarding cases to the War Crimes Team

6. Case Assessment by War Crimes Team

6.1 Cases of no interest

6.2 Cases of interest

6.3 Determination of assessment

6.4 Updates

6.5 Impact on Target Dates

7. Excluding Suspected War Criminals from Convention Protection

7.1 Seriousness of Exclusion

7.2 Refusals under both Articles 1F and 1A(2)

7.3 No Balancing Test

7.4 Certification under Section 55 of the IAN Act 2006

7.5 Drafting the RFRL

7.6 Exclusion from HP

7.7 Applicants who Cannot be Removed for Human Rights Reasons

7.8 Referring Decision Letters to WCT

8. Action Prior to Service of Exclusion

9. Dealing with Cases where the claim is being considered in the Detained Fast Track (DFT) or Detained NSA

9.1 War Crimes and DFT / Detained NSA

9.2 Actions for Staff in DFT / Detained NSA

9.3 War Crimes Team Actions

10. Dealing with Dependents where a Main Applicant is Suspected of Involvement in War Crimes

11. Appeal Rights

12. Applications for Further Leave Following Grants of Humanitarian Protection and Discretionary Leave

13. War Crimes Referral Template

Glossary

Document Control

1. Introduction

1.1 Purpose of Instruction

This Asylum Instruction gives guidance to staff involved in decision making on how to determine whether there are serious reasons for considering that an asylum applicant has committed or been complicit in war crimes, crimes against humanity or genocide.

This Asylum Instruction also gives guidance on what action should be taken by staff where an applicant has been identified as someone who may have committed or been complicit in war crimes, crimes against humanity or genocide.

[Back to contents](#)

1.2 Use of Terms

Throughout these instructions the term:

“War crimes” includes war crimes, crimes against humanity and genocide.

“Case owner” refers to case owners or caseworkers within the Regional Asylum Teams, Detained Fast-Track (DFT), Criminal Casework Directorate (CCD), or the Case Resolution Directorate (CRD).

“Senior Caseworkers” applies to SEO Senior Caseworkers within the regional teams or DFT and to Technical Specialists within CRD.

“Presenting Officer” refers to Regional Asylum Team or DFT case owners, Regional Presenting Officers or Specialist Appeal Team members who are responsible for presenting cases at appeal.

“Applicant”, **“individual”**, **“person”** and **“subject”** are all interchangeable terms referring to the asylum seeker.

“1951 Convention” and **“Refugee Convention”** are used interchangeably when referring to the 1951 United Nations Convention relating to the Status of Refugees and the 1967 Protocol to that Convention.

An explanation of terms and abbreviations specific to this instruction are explained in [the Glossary](#).

[Back to contents](#)

2. Background

The 1951 Convention relating to the Status of Refugees recognises that signatory states may identify persons applying for refugee status whose actions mean it would not be appropriate for them to enjoy the protection offered by the Convention.

These actions are specified within the provisions of Article 1F of the 1951 Convention. Any action committed by a person and which falls within the scope of the Article 1F exclusion clauses would result in them being excluded from international protection.

The provision relating to involvement in war crimes is contained within Article 1F (a), the full text of which states:

“The provisions of the Convention shall not apply to any person with respect to whom there are serious reasons for considering that he has committed a crime against peace, a war crime, or a crime against humanity, as defined in the international instruments drawn up to make provision in respect of such crimes;

For further guidance on the application of Article 1F exclusion clauses, refer to the Asylum Instruction on [Exclusion: Articles 1F and 33\(2\) of the 1951 Refugee Convention](#).

The rationale behind the exclusion clauses is given in paragraph 148 of the UNHCR Handbook on Procedures and Criteria for determining Refugee Status and which states that:

“At the time when the Convention was drafted, the memory of the trials of major war criminals was still very much alive, and there was agreement on the part of the States that war criminals should not be protected...”

In the 2002 White Paper “*Secure Borders, Safe Haven*”, the Government made a commitment that the United Kingdom should not provide a safe haven for war criminals or those who commit crimes against humanity.

In order to meet this commitment the UK Border Agency War Crimes Team (WCT) was set up in March 2004 to focus on modern day war crimes.

[Back to contents](#)

3. The War Crimes Team

The War Crimes Team (WCT) works with colleagues throughout the UK Border Agency to assist in the identification of people who may have committed or been complicit in war crimes, and to support action against them such as refusal of leave to enter, exclusion from refugee status and deprivation of citizenship. If such a person already has refugee status in the United Kingdom, it may be appropriate to initiate revocation action.

For further guidance on the revocation of refugee status, refer to the AI on *Cancellation, Cessation and Revocation of Refugee Status*.

The primary role of the WCT is that of an advisory and investigative body. The unit is mainly responsible for researching and analysing cases with a view to making recommendations to operational colleagues.

WCT does not have a caseworking capacity and can only make recommendations on the basis of its research on the likelihood of involvement in war crimes. It does not exist to make decisions on behalf of case owners.

[Back to contents](#)

4. Conducting the Asylum Interview of a Suspected War Criminal

4.1 Forwarding cases to the War Crimes Team

For further information on the asylum interview, refer to the AI on *Conducting Asylum Interviews*.

In some instances, evidence of war crimes may only come to light during the interview. Officers should be prepared to explore any new areas as they arise during the interview.

[Back to contents](#)

4.2 Post-Interview Analysis

Where it is considered that an applicant may have committed or been complicit in war crimes, Case Resolution Directorate (CRD) caseworkers should write a comprehensive minute for the attention of a Senior Caseworker to indicate this. Senior Caseworkers will then refer the case using the War Crimes Referral Template to WCT by email.

Regional Asylum Team Case Owners can refer cases direct to WCT, without referring to a Senior Caseworker, using the War Crimes Referral Template.

The file should be minuted to indicate that the applicant is suspected of having committed or been complicit in War Crimes. Case files should not be sent to WCT at this point.

For further guidance on writing minutes, refer to the AI on *Minute Writing*.

[Back to contents](#)

5. Identification of Suspected War Criminals

5.1 Credibility Issues

If there is any evidence that an applicant may have committed or been complicit in war crimes, officers should refer the case to the War Crimes Team for consideration. Although it may be that an applicant has mentioned involvement with a particular organisation or participation in a certain event in an effort to enhance their asylum claim, this will be for the War Crimes Team to consider. WCT will be responsible for assessing whether the elements of the claim relating to war crimes are deemed to be credible.

Case Owners may see cases where an applicant's credibility is uncertain and where there are doubts over whether the case should be referred to the War Crimes Team (WCT). In these instances, the Case Owner must always err on the side of caution and forward the case to the WCT.

Where the applicant claims to have committed or been complicit in war crimes but the claim is not found to be credible, the case can be decided by the Case Owner.

Any refusal of asylum should be drafted on the standard RFRL template **ASL.0015** and the case should not be certified under section 55 of the Immigration, Asylum and Nationality Act 2006. Following consideration under Article 1A (2) and any credibility issues, the Case Owner should clearly state that if the claim were considered to be credible, the individual would be excluded from Convention protection under Article 1F (a).

For further guidance on the application of Article 1F exclusion clauses, refer to the Asylum Instruction on *Exclusion: Articles 1F and 33(2) of the 1951 Refugee Convention*.

[Back to contents](#)

5.2 Forwarding cases to the War Crimes Team

When referring a case to the War Crimes Team, Case Resolution Directorate (CRD) Senior Caseworkers and Regional Asylum Team Case Owners should prepare a copy of the War Crimes Referral Template.

They should include a brief background of the basis of claim and as much information as possible in relation to the applicant having committed or been complicit in war crimes. It is particularly important that all details regarding the applicant's possible involvement with organisations involved in war crimes are included in the War Crimes Referral Template since assessment by War Crimes Team (WCT) on whether or not the case merits further investigation will be based on this information.

The completed referral template should then be sent to WCT by email.

[Back to contents](#)

6. Case Assessment by War Crimes Team

Based upon the information provided by the Case Owner, the War Crimes Team (WCT) will make an initial assessment on whether the case merits further investigation. WCT aims to confirm whether or not they have an interest in a case within 48 hours of receiving an email referral post interview.

If this deadline is missed, the onus is on the referrer to contact WCT according to need.

[Back to contents](#)

6.1 Cases of no interest

Where War Crimes Team (WCT) considers that a case does not merit further investigation they will email the referrer to indicate this and explain why.

[Back to contents](#)

6.2 Cases of interest

Where War Crimes Team (WCT) considers that a case merits further investigation, they will request the case file and conduct further enquiries.

It may be that during their investigations they need further information from the applicant. If this is the case, WCT will return the case file to the Case Owner with a request that the applicant is re-interviewed. WCT will also include a Case Research and Analysis Report (Case Report) providing guidance on lines of questioning and specific areas to concentrate on. When a Senior Caseworker or Case Owner receives such a request, they should arrange for an interviewing officer to conduct the interview and book a further interview.

The interviewing officer must contact the WCT prior to the interview to discuss the issues raised in the Case Report. The Case Owner should use this opportunity to raise any concerns they have about the lines of questioning with the WCT analyst.

During the interview, the interviewing officer must ask all the questions in the lines of questioning. The interviewing officer must ensure that they are persistent in their questioning to ensure that the applicant provides a full answer to the question being put to them. By doing this it will reduce the likelihood that a further interview will need to be conducted.

Following interview, the case file should promptly be returned to WCT so that they may conclude their enquiries.

[Back to contents](#)

6.3 Determination of assessment

Upon completion of their investigations, War Crimes Team (WCT) will determine whether or not there are serious reasons for considering that the applicant has committed or been complicit in war crimes.

If WCT consider that there is insufficient evidence to suggest involvement in war crimes, they will return the case file to the Case Owner for consideration of the asylum claim as normal.

Even in cases where WCT have not recommended exclusion under 1F(a), Case Owners should still give consideration to whether the applicant should be excluded from the Refugee Convention under any of the other exclusion clauses.

For further guidance on the application of Article 1F exclusion clauses, refer to the Asylum Instruction on [Exclusion: Articles 1F and 33\(2\) of the 1951 Refugee Convention](#).

However, if the WCT analyst thinks there are serious reasons for considering that the applicant has committed or been complicit in war crimes, they will draft a Case Research and Analysis Report (Case Report). This report will explain the reasons why WCT considers that there are serious reasons for considering that the applicant may have been involved in war crimes. WCT will return the case file, including the Case Report, to the Case Owner.

Where WCT has returned a case file with a Case Report indicating involvement in war crimes to a Senior Caseworker in the Case Resolution Directorate (CRD), the Senior Caseworker should then follow the instructions in [7. Excluding Suspected War Criminals from Convention Protection](#).

If the file has been forwarded to a Case Owner in one of the Regional Asylum Teams, they should liaise with a Senior Caseworker to reach a decision as to whether exclusion would be appropriate.

[Back to contents](#)

6.4 Updates

Within four weeks of receiving the Case Report, Case Owners or Senior Caseworkers (in CRD) must contact WCT by email to give them a progress report and to confirm the following:

- That they are proceeding with exclusion, or
- That they are not proceeding with exclusion and explain the reasons why, or
- To request further input from WCT before deciding on the next course of action.

Where a Senior Caseworker concludes that there are serious reasons for considering that an applicant has committed or been complicit in war crimes, the applicant **must** be excluded from Convention protection by virtue of Article 1F(a).

See [7. Excluding Suspected War Criminals from Convention Protection](#).

[Back to contents](#)

6.5 Impact on Target Dates

If a case identified by War Crimes Team (WCT) as a possible war criminal or as meriting further investigation is likely to miss any decision target date, it should be allowed to miss these targets due to the particular nature of these cases.

War Crimes Team (WCT) should contact the originating Case Resolution Directorate (CRD) unit or Regional Asylum Team Case Owner from which the case was referred and inform them that the case will miss its decision target date and the reasons for this.

[Back to contents](#)

7. Excluding Suspected War Criminals from Convention Protection

7.1 Seriousness of Exclusion

Excluding an applicant from Convention protection is a serious matter. As a consequence, such cases must always be seen by Senior Caseworkers regardless of whether the claim is being handled in the Case Resolution Directorate or the Regional Asylum Teams.

In the Case Resolution Directorate, this decision must be made by a Senior Caseworker.

In the Regional Asylum Teams, the Case Owner must liaise with a Senior Caseworker before deciding whether exclusion action is appropriate.

Where War Crimes Team (WCT) has prepared a Case Research and Analysis Report (Case Report) that concludes that there are serious reasons for considering that an applicant has committed or been complicit in war crimes, it is for a Senior Caseworker to decide whether exclusion is appropriate having considered all the evidence supplied by WCT. Senior Caseworkers can seek further guidance or clarification from WCT on any issues or points raised in the Case Report.

Senior Caseworkers should note that when excluding an applicant under Article 1F the normal procedure is to consider the asylum claim in its totality. This means that the claim must be considered against the well-founded issue (Article 1A (2)) and the applicant's position under Article 1F.

[Back to contents](#)

7.2 Refusals under both Articles 1F and 1A(2)

Where grounds exist for refusing a claim both under Article 1F and under Article 1A (2), Senior Caseworkers should do so using **both** grounds, not one alone, in order to ensure the decision can be robustly defended at any subsequent appeal.

This would include either (a) when the applicant is being excluded or (b) when the applicant is found not to be credible but if their account was credible they would fall to be excluded.

The RFRL should first deal with the exclusion on 1F grounds and then go on to deal with refusal under 1A; including any credibility issues. The 'belt and braces' approach ensures that full reasons are provided for all aspects of the decision.

[Back to contents](#)

7.3 No Balancing Test

In considering whether Article 1F applies in a case where the person appears to have a well founded fear of persecution, there is to be no weighing up ("balancing") of the amount of persecution feared against the gravity of the Article 1F crime or act which it is considered has been committed.

Having considered all relevant issues with care, Senior Caseworkers must use Article 1F to exclude the applicant from Convention protection in all instances where it is applicable. Where Article 1F applies, the person concerned **cannot** be a refugee. The 1951 Convention contains no requirement to treat the crime as being expired by virtue of already having been punished for it. The fact that a person has been convicted and punished for an offence does not mean that Article 1F does not apply.

[Back to contents](#)

7.4 Certification under Section 55 of the IAN Act 2006

Where Article 1F(a) applies, the claim should be certified under section 55 of the IAN Act 2006. Section 55 of the IAN Act 2006 provides for cases that are excluded by virtue of Article 1F that the Secretary of State can issue a certificate and the Asylum and Immigration Tribunal (AIT) or the Special Immigration Appeals Commission (SIAC) must then begin substantive deliberations on any asylum appeal by considering the certificate.

If the AIT / SIAC agree with the statements in the certificate, they must dismiss the asylum claim i.e. *they must consider exclusion first and if they agree that the person is excluded they need not consider whether Article 1A of the Convention applies.*

It is not appropriate to apply a certificate in a case where a ‘belt and braces’ refusal has been made.

Senior Caseworkers should use the RFRL template **ASL.3212**. The template provides the framework for exclusion under 1F(a) as well as the other 1F categories, the certificate and formal exclusion of Humanitarian Protection. Also, where appropriate, refusal of asylum under Article 1A(2).

[Back to contents](#)

7.5 Drafting the RFRL

The reasons for exclusion should be based on the information provided in the Case Report prepared by the WCT. The RFRL should outline the international legal instruments (*as mentioned in the Legal Annexe of the WCT Case Report*) being relied on. The draft RFRL should be copied, by e-mail, to the WCT for comments before it is served. Any deadlines of serving the decision should be flagged to the WCT.

The hard copies of evidence provided by WCT to support the recommendation must be attached to the PF1.

The name, telephone number and address of the War Crimes Team analyst must **not**, however, be disclosed outside of the UK Border Agency.

Senior Caseworkers should use the RFRL template (ASL.3212) and follow the standard minute sheets. In all cases, the case should be marked for “Assured Representation”.

The draft RFRL and any submission must be forwarded to the relevant WCT senior analyst by e-mail for comment. WCT will provide comments within 48 hours of receipt.

For further guidance on the application of Article 1F exclusion clauses, refer to the Asylum Instruction on Exclusion: Articles 1F and 33(2) of the 1951 Refugee Convention.

[Back to contents](#)

7.6 Exclusion from HP

Senior Caseworkers should handle cases where the applicant is being excluded from Convention protection. This applies to cases handled in both the Case Resolution Directorate and the Regional Asylum Teams.

Senior Caseworkers should note that where there are serious reasons for considering that an applicant has participated in war crimes they will fall to be excluded from Humanitarian Protection.

Since the 9 October 2006, the criteria for granting Humanitarian Protection has been contained within paragraph 339C of the Immigration Rules, which includes the clause that “he is not excluded from humanitarian protection”.

A person is excluded from a grant of Humanitarian Protection under paragraph 339D where the Secretary of State is satisfied that:

- (i) there are serious reasons for considering that he has committed a crime against peace, a war crime, a crime against humanity, or any other serious crime or instigated or otherwise participated in such crimes;
- (ii) there are serious reasons for considering that he is guilty of acts contrary to the purposes and principles of the United Nations or has committed, prepared or instigated such acts or encouraged or induced others to commit, prepare or instigate instigated such acts;
- (iii) there are serious reasons for considering that he constitutes a danger to the community or to the security of the United Kingdom; or
- (iv) prior to his admission to the United Kingdom the person committed a crime outside the scope of (i) and (ii) that would be punishable by imprisonment were it committed in the United Kingdom and the person left his country of origin solely in order to avoid sanctions resulting from the crime.

So by virtue of (i) above the applicant will be excluded from Humanitarian Protection. However, it may not be possible to remove the applicant for Human Rights reasons.

For further information on exclusion from HP, refer to the AI on *Humanitarian Protection*.

[Back to contents](#)

7.7 Applicants who Cannot be Removed for Human Rights Reasons

If it is considered that removal would constitute a breach of either Articles 2 and/or 3, e.g. applicant is at real risk of death or inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment, the Senior Caseworker should, in consultation with WCT and AOPU, arrange for the case to be brought to the attention of the Chief Executive.

Applicants who fall to be excluded from the 1951 Convention and Humanitarian Protection will normally be placed on Discretionary Leave for a period of six months.

All proposals to grant Discretionary Leave in these circumstances must be passed by the Chief Executive.

When considering Article 8, Senior Caseworkers should note that persons involved in war crimes are excluded from Discretionary Leave unless it is not possible to remove them from the United Kingdom. Officers should also bear in mind that, since there is a proportionality test (*the right to private and family life balanced against the interests of national security, public safety or the economic wellbeing of the country*), the fact that a person fits into an exclusion category may well mean that their removal would not be a breach of Article 8. However, each case will be different and must be treated on its merits. If Senior Caseworkers consider that removal may be a breach of Article 8 they should bring the case to the attention of the Chief Executive.

Individuals who have been granted a limited period of Discretionary Leave by agreement of Ministers will be subject to a review of their leave every six months until removal becomes a

viable option. In order to be eligible to apply for settlement in the United Kingdom, they will need to have accrued ten years' continuous grants of limited leave.

For further guidance on granting a limited period of Discretionary Leave, refer to the Asylum Instruction on *Discretionary Leave*.

[Back to contents](#)

7.8 Referring Decision Letters to WCT

The Case Owner / Senior Caseworker should:

1. Draft RFRL (ASL.3212) and do a final print.
2. Locate the letter from printed documents and choose properties.
3. Record "Draft for WCT" and put a stop on the letter.
4. Copy and Paste the RFRL (ASL.3212) on a Word Document.
5. Save the document entitled "*HO Reference – RFRL Draft*"
6. Insert/attach the Word Document to an email and send it to War Crimes Team entitled exactly as the saved document title.
7. Include contact details in the email.

The WCT Analyst should then:

1. Locate the Word Document from the email received.
2. Make any changes necessary / appropriate.
3. Save the same entitled Word Document "*HO Reference – RFRL Draft*".
4. Send the saved Word Document as an attachment to the Senior Caseworker / Case Owner by email, titling the email "*Draft for SCW*" as per contact details in the email.
5. Include contact details in the email.

[Back to contents](#)

8. Action Prior to Service of Exclusion

Prior to serving the exclusion decision, Senior Caseworkers can check with War Crimes Team (WCT) to see if they have any further interest in the case.

In some cases WCT may refer the case to the Metropolitan Police who may consider pursuing a criminal prosecution. It should be noted, however, that United Kingdom jurisdiction over an offence committed abroad before September 2001 is limited.

WCT Case Reports and the evidence cited within them are disclosable at appeal (*unless stated otherwise*). Officers should ensure that all the evidence provided by WCT to support the recommendation is included in the PF1 bundle.

The name, address and contact number of the War Crimes Team analyst must **not**, however, be disclosed outside of the UK Border Agency.

[Back to contents](#)

9. Dealing with Cases where the claim is being considered in the Detained Fast Track (DFT) or Detained NSA

9.1 War Crimes and DFT / Detained NSA

This section sets out additional processes specifically covering issues that are unique to the DFT and detained NSA locations. They should be acted upon in conjunction with the wider referral process as set out in this Asylum Instruction.

It is recognised that the cases under the DFT and detained NSA procedure are subject to different deadlines and pressures than other cases within the asylum system. Given that the applicants are detained and, should their claim be unsuccessful, their removal can be achieved in a much quicker timeframe, it has been agreed that cases where there is minimal evidence of involvement in War Crimes or Crimes against Humanity should continue to be processed in the detained locations. Only cases where there is substantial evidence that the applicant has been involved in War Crimes or Crimes against Humanity will consideration be given to removing them from the DFT to allow more detailed investigation to take place.

Substantial evidence would include an admission that the applicant had committed serious offences which might amount to war crimes or crimes against humanity; that he had held a position of authority within an organisation known to have committed war crimes or crimes against humanity; or evidence of a lengthy period of voluntary membership during a relevant time period.

Further information about organisations of interest can be found in the War Crimes Interviewing Aid.

[Back to contents](#)

9.2 Actions for Staff in DFT / Detained NSA

Staff in the DFT and detained NSA process should:

- Refer the case to the WCT in the usual way if, after the interview and having consulted the Interviewing Aid, the Case Owner thinks that there is cause to believe that the applicant may have been involved in war crimes or crimes against humanity.
- Fax a copy of the file to the War Crimes Team if WCT requests sight of the file. The name of the individual analyst who requested the file should be clearly noted on the fax header.
- Ensure that contact is maintained with the WCT analyst to keep them informed of any relevant developments in the case. Staff from the DFT or detained NSA will be responsible for maintaining contact with the applicant
- Remember that even in cases where WCT do not recommend exclusion under Article 1F (a) that other exclusion clauses may apply

For further guidance on the application of Article 1F exclusion clauses, refer to the Asylum Instruction on Exclusion: Articles 1F and 33(2) of the 1951 Refugee Convention.

[Back to contents](#)

9.3 War Crimes Team Actions

Staff in War Crimes Team will:

- Inform staff in the detained fast track or detained NSA system within 24 hours of receipt of the e-mail referral whether a case is of interest to the War Crimes Team.
- Ensure that contact is maintained with the relevant Case Owner within the DFT or detained NSA process to keep them up to date with how the case is progressing on a case by case basis.
- Ensure that the case is given priority and that work continues to occur on it whilst the applicant remains in detention. It is vital that any problems with processing the case are communicated to the Case Owner as soon as possible.
- When an RFRL is sent to the War Crimes Team it should be looked at within 24 hours of receipt and feedback given to the case owner.

[Back to contents](#)

10. Dealing with Dependants where a Main Applicant is Suspected of Involvement in War Crimes

Family members of applicants who have been excluded from Convention protection on grounds of involvement in war crimes will normally fall to be refused in-line with the main applicant.

However, some dependants may also apply for asylum in their own right, and such claims should be considered on their merits. They cannot be excluded from the protection of the Refugee Convention solely because of the actions of the main applicant. If the dependant's own asylum claim meets the requirements for inclusion under Article 1A, and they are not excluded from protection due to their own actions, they should be granted asylum.

Individuals may seek to remain as dependants of asylum seekers or refugees but appear to have committed an act which, had they been seeking asylum in their own right, would make them potential candidates for exclusion under Article 1F or 33(2). In such cases, consideration should be given to whether the conditions of Article 1F or 33(2) are met. If they are met, the application to enter or remain as dependants should be refused.

Individuals who seek to be dependants on other claims and have been excluded from the protection of the Refugee Convention as a result of their own actions should not be given leave in line with the main applicant.

For further guidance on dealing with the dependants of asylum applicants suspected of involvement in war crimes, refer to the Asylum Instruction on *Exclusion: Articles 1F and 33(2) of the 1951 Refugee Convention*.

[Back to contents](#)

11. Appeal Rights

The rights of appeal against a decision to exclude from Convention protection are the same as those against refusal of asylum and are triggered by the accompanying immigration decision. The specific right of appeal to which an applicant is entitled depends on the specific immigration decision.

However, where the applicant is to be excluded from Convention protection by virtue of Article 1F(a) then section 55 of the Immigration, Asylum and Nationality Act 2006 will also apply and a certificate is to be issued but no such certificate should be issued in belt and braces cases.

The AIT / SIAC must deal first with the Secretary of State's certificate. If the certificate is upheld, the appeal must be dismissed to the extent that it relies on asylum grounds, though any ECHR considerations raised in the appeal will still have to be taken into account.

For further information see the Asylum Instruction on *Rights of Appeal in Asylum Claims*.

[Back to contents](#)

12. Applications for Further Leave Following Grants of Humanitarian Protection and Discretionary Leave

Although this guidance is specifically aimed at staff involved in asylum decision making, Case Owners involved in considering applications for further leave following grants of Humanitarian Protection or Discretionary Leave should also refer to these instructions.

When considering applications for further leave, Case Owners should thoroughly check through the file and compare with the information contained within whether or not an interview has been conducted. If an interview has not already been conducted, the Case Owner should invite the applicant to attend an interview.

As the Asylum Instruction for *Considering Applications for Further Leave Following ELTE, ELTR, HP & DL (Active Reviews)* is currently being revised, contact AOPU for further information on Active Reviews.

In addition, some applicants will apply for further leave after initially being granted Exceptional Leave to Remain (ELR) for a period of four years.

For further information on this, refer to the AIs on *Exceptional Leave To Remain: Not Appropriate to Grant Settlement* and *Exceptional Leave to Remain: Suspected War Criminals and Perpetrators of Crimes against Humanity and Genocide*.

[Back to contents](#)

13. War Crimes Referral Template

Instructions for use:

1. Open the War Crimes Referral Template.
2. Complete all relevant sections as appropriate.
3. Save the document as WAR CRIMES REFERRAL HO Ref. No.
4. Attach the Word document to a blank email and send to War Crimes Team

WCT aims to respond to all email referrals within 24 hours for pre-interview referrals and 48 hours for post interview referrals.

Should you wish to discuss your referral, particularly where it is urgent, speak to the duty officer.

[Back to contents](#)

Glossary

Term	Meaning
ASL.3212	Exclusion from Refugee Convention RFRL template
ASL.0015	Standard RFRL
IAN Act 2006	Immigration, Asylum and Nationality Act 2006

[Back to contents](#)

Document Control

Change Record

Version	Authors	Date	Change Reference
3.0	MS (AOPU) JE (WCT)	10/03/07	Approved for Publication
4.0	BN	14/11/08	Update branding only

[Back to contents](#)