This text is meant purely as a documentation tool and has no legal effect. The Union's institutions do not assume any liability for its contents. The authentic versions of the relevant acts, including their preambles, are those published in the Official Journal of the European Union and available in EUR-Lex. Those official texts are directly accessible through the links embedded in this document

►**B**

COUNCIL REGULATION (EU) No 270/2011

of 21 March 2011

concerning restrictive measures directed against certain persons, entities and bodies in view of the situation in Egypt

(OJ L 76, 22.3.2011, p. 4)

Amended by:

		Official Journal		
		No	page	date
►**M1**	Council Regulation (EU) No 1099/2012 of 26 November 2012	L 327	14	27.11.2012
►**M2**	Council Regulation (EU) No 517/2013 of 13 May 2013	L 158	1	10.6.2013
►**M3**	Council Implementing Regulation (EU) 2017/490 of 21 March 2017	L 76	8	22.3.2017
►**M4**	Council Implementing Regulation (EU) 2017/491 of 21 March 2017	L 76	10	22.3.2017
►**M5**	Council Implementing Regulation (EU) 2018/465 of 21 March 2018	L 78 I	1	21.3.2018
►**M6**	Council Implementing Regulation (EU) 2019/459 of 21 March 2019	L 80	1	22.3.2019
►**M7**	Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) 2019/1163 of 5 July 2019	L 182	33	8.7.2019

▼B

COUNCIL REGULATION (EU) No 270/2011

of 21 March 2011

concerning restrictive measures directed against certain persons, entities and bodies in view of the situation in Egypt

Article 1

For the purposes of this Regulation, the following definitions shall apply:

(a) 'funds' means financial assets and benefits of every kind, including but not limited to:

(i) cash, cheques, claims on money, drafts, money orders and other payment instruments;

(ii) deposits with financial institutions or other entities, balances on accounts, debts and debt obligations;

(iii) publicly and privately traded securities and debt instruments, including stocks and shares, certificates representing securities, bonds, notes, warrants, debentures and derivatives contracts;

(iv) interest, dividends or other income on or value accruing from or generated by assets;

(v) credit, right of set-off, guarantees, performance bonds or other financial commitments;

(vi) letters of credit, bills of lading and bills of sale;

(vii) documents evidencing an interest in funds or financial resources;

(b) 'freezing of funds' means preventing any move, transfer, alteration, use of, access to, or dealing with funds in any way that would result in any change in their volume, amount, location, ownership, possession, character, destination or other change that would enable the funds to be used, including portfolio management;

(c) 'economic resources' means assets of every kind, whether tangible or intangible, movable or immovable, which are not funds but may be used to obtain funds, goods or services;

(d) 'freezing of economic resources' means preventing their use to obtain funds, goods or services in any way, including, but not limited to, by selling, hiring or mortgaging them;

▼B

(e) ‘territory of the Union’ means the territories of the Member States to which the Treaty is applicable, under the conditions laid down in the Treaty, including their airspace.

Article 2

1. All funds and economic resources belonging to, or owned, held or controlled by, persons who, as referred to in Article 1(1) of Decision 2011/172/CFSP, have been identified as being responsible for the misappropriation of Egyptian State funds, and natural or legal persons, entities and bodies associated with them, as listed in Annex I, shall be frozen.

2. No funds or economic resources shall be made available, directly or indirectly, to or for the benefit of the natural or legal persons, entities or bodies listed in Annex I.

3. The participation, knowingly and intentionally, in activities the object or effect of which is, directly or indirectly, to circumvent the measures referred to in paragraphs 1 and 2 shall be prohibited.

Article 3

1. Annex I shall include the grounds for listing of listed natural or legal persons, entities and bodies concerned.

2. Annex I shall also include, where available, information necessary to identify the natural or legal persons, entities and bodies concerned. With regard to natural persons, such information may include names, including aliases, date and place of birth, nationality, passport and ID card numbers, gender, address if known, and function or profession. With regard to legal persons, entities and bodies, such information may include names, place and date of registration, registration number and place of business.

Article 4

1. By way of derogation from Article 2, the competent authorities of the Member States, as indicated on the websites listed in Annex II, may authorise the release of certain frozen funds or economic resources, or the making available of certain funds or economic resources, under such conditions as they deem appropriate, after having determined that the funds or economic resources are:

(a) necessary to satisfy the basic needs of natural persons listed in Annex I and their dependent family members, including payments for foodstuffs, rent or mortgage, medicines and medical treatment, taxes, insurance premiums, and public utility charges;

▼B

(b) intended exclusively for the payment of reasonable professional fees or the reimbursement of incurred expenses associated with the provision of legal services;

(c) intended exclusively for the payment of fees or service charges for routine holding or maintenance of frozen funds or economic resources; or

(d) necessary for extraordinary expenses, provided that the Member State concerned has notified all other Member States and the Commission of the grounds on which it considers that a specific authorisation should be granted, at least 2 weeks prior to the authorisation.

2. The Member State concerned shall inform the other Member States and the Commission of any authorisation granted under paragraph 1.

▼M1

Article 5

1. By way of derogation from Article 2, the competent authorities in Member States, as indicated on the websites listed in Annex II, may authorise the release of certain frozen funds or economic resources, provided the following conditions are met:

(a) the funds or economic resources are the subject of an arbitral decision rendered prior to the date on which the natural or legal person, entity or body referred to in Article 2 was listed in Annex I, or of a judicial or administrative decision rendered in the Union, or a judicial decision enforceable in the Member State concerned, prior to or after that date;

(b) the funds or economic resources will be used exclusively to satisfy claims secured by such a decision or recognised as valid in such a decision, within the limits set by applicable laws and regulations governing the rights of persons having such claims;

(c) the decision is not for the benefit of a natural or legal person, entity or body listed in Annex I; and

(d) recognising the decision is not contrary to public policy in the Member State concerned.

2. The Member State concerned shall inform the other Member States and the Commission of any authorisation granted under this Article.

▼B

Article 6

▼M1

1. Article 2(2) shall not apply to the addition to frozen accounts of:

(a) interest or other earnings on those accounts; or

▼M1

(b) payments due under contracts, agreements or obligations that were concluded or arose before the date on which the natural or legal person, entity or body referred to in Article 2 has been listed in Annex I; or

(c) payments due under judicial, administrative or arbitral decisions rendered in the Union or enforceable in the Member State concerned,

provided that such interest, other earnings and payments are frozen in accordance with Article 2(1).

▼B

2. Article 2(2) shall not prevent financial or credit institutions in the Union from crediting frozen accounts where they receive funds transferred to the account of a listed natural or legal person, entity or body, provided that any additions to such accounts will also be frozen. The financial or credit institution shall inform the relevant competent authority about any such transaction without delay.

Article 7

By way of derogation from Article 2 and provided that a payment by a natural or legal person, entity or body listed in Annex I is due under a contract or agreement that was concluded by, or an obligation that arose for, the person, entity or body concerned, before the date on which that person, entity or body was listed in Annex I, the competent authorities of the Member States, as indicated on the websites listed in Annex II, may authorise, under such conditions as they deem appropriate, the release of certain frozen funds or economic resources, if the following conditions are met:

(a) the competent authority concerned has determined that:

(i) the funds or economic resources shall be used for a payment by a person, entity or body listed in Annex I; and

(ii) the payment is not in breach of Article 2(2);

(b) the Member State concerned has, at least 2 weeks prior to the grant of the authorisation, notified the other Member States and the Commission of that determination and its intention to grant an authorisation.

Article 8

1. The freezing of funds and economic resources or the refusal to make funds or economic resources available, carried out in good faith on the basis that such action is in accordance with this Regulation, shall not give rise to liability of any kind on the part of the natural or legal person or entity or body implementing it, or its directors or employees, unless it is proved that the funds and economic resources were frozen or withheld as a result of negligence.

▼B

2. The prohibition set out in Article 2(2) shall not give rise to any liability of any kind on the part of the natural and legal persons, entities and bodies who made funds or economic resources available if they did not know, and had no reasonable cause to suspect, that their actions would infringe the prohibition in question.

Article 9

1. Without prejudice to the applicable rules concerning reporting, confidentiality and professional secrecy, natural and legal persons, entities and bodies shall:

(a) supply immediately any information which would facilitate compliance with this Regulation, such as accounts and amounts frozen in accordance with Article 2(1), to the competent authority in the Member State where they are resident or located, as indicated on the websites listed in Annex II, and shall transmit such information, either directly or through the Member States, to the Commission; and

(b) cooperate with that competent authority in any verification of this information.

2. Any information provided or received in accordance with this Article shall be used only for the purposes for which it was provided or received.

▼M1

3. Paragraph 2 shall not prevent Member States from sharing that information, in accordance with their national law, with the relevant authorities of Egypt and other Member States where necessary for the purpose of assisting the recovery of misappropriated assets.

▼B

Article 10

The Commission and Member States shall immediately inform each other of the measures taken under this Regulation and shall supply each other with any other relevant information at their disposal in connection with this Regulation, in particular information in respect of violation and enforcement problems and judgments handed down by national courts.

Article 11

The Commission shall be empowered to amend Annex II on the basis of information supplied by Member States.

Article 12

1. Where the Council decides to subject a natural or legal person, entity or body to the measures referred to in Article 2(1), it shall amend Annex I accordingly.

2. The Council shall communicate the decision referred to in paragraph 1, including the grounds for listing, to the natural or legal person, entity or body concerned, either directly, if the address is known, or through the publication of a notice, providing such person, entity or body with an opportunity to present observations.

▼B

3. Where observations are submitted, or where substantial new evidence is presented, the Council shall review the decision referred to in paragraph 1 and inform the person, entity or body concerned accordingly.

4. The list in Annex I shall be reviewed at regular intervals and at least every 12 months as from 21 March 2011.

Article 13

1. Member States shall lay down the rules on penalties applicable to infringements of the provisions of this Regulation and shall take all measures necessary to ensure that they are implemented. The penalties provided for shall be effective, proportionate and dissuasive.

2. Member States shall notify the Commission of those rules without delay after the entry into force of this Regulation and shall notify it of any subsequent amendment to them.

Article 14

Where there is, in this Regulation, a requirement to notify, inform or otherwise communicate with the Commission, the address and other contact details to be used for such communication shall be those indicated in Annex II.

Article 15

This Regulation shall apply:

(a) within the territory of the Union;

(b) on board any aircraft or any vessel under the jurisdiction of a Member State;

(c) to any person inside or outside the territory of the Union who is a national of a Member State;

(d) to any legal person, entity or body which is incorporated or constituted under the law of a Member State;

(e) to any legal person, entity or body in respect of any business done in whole or in part within the Union.

Article 16

This Regulation shall enter into force on the day of its publication in the *Official Journal of the European Union*.

This Regulation shall be binding in its entirety and directly applicable in all Member States.

▼**M6**

ANNEX I

A. List of natural and legal persons, entities and bodies referred to in Article 2(1)

	Name (and any aliases)	Identifying information	Grounds for designation
1.	Mohamed Hosni Elsayed Mubarak	Former President of the Arab Republic of Egypt Date of birth: 4.5.1928 Male	Person subject to judicial proceedings or an asset recovery process by the Egyptian authorities following a final court ruling in respect of the misappropriation of State Funds on the basis of the United Nations Convention against corruption.
2.	Suzanne Saleh Thabet	Spouse of Mr Mohamed Hosni Elsayed Mubarak, former President of the Arab Republic of Egypt Date of birth: 28.2.1941 Female	Associated with Mohamed Hosni Elsayed Mubarak, who is subject to judicial proceedings or an asset recovery process by the Egyptian authorities following a final court ruling in respect of the misappropriation of State Funds on the basis of the United Nations Convention against corruption.
3.	Alaa Mohamed Hosni Elsayed Mubarak	Son of Mr. Mohamed Hosni Elsayed Mubarak, former President of the Arab Republic of Egypt Date of birth: 26.11.1960 Male	Person subject to judicial proceedings or an asset recovery process by the Egyptian authorities following a final court ruling in respect of the misappropriation of State Funds on the basis of the United Nations Convention against corruption.
4.	Heidy Mahmoud Magdy Hussein Rasekh	Spouse of Mr Alaa Mohamed Elsayed Mubarak, son of former President of the Arab Republic of Egypt Date of birth: 5.10.1971 Female	Person subject to judicial proceedings or an asset recovery process by the Egyptian authorities following a final court ruling in respect of the misappropriation of State Funds on the basis of the United Nations Convention against corruption, and associated with Alaa Mohamed Hosni Elsayed Mubarak.
5.	Gamal Mohamed Hosni Elsayed Mubarak	Son of Mr. Mohamed Hosni Elsayed Mubarak, former President of the Arab Republic of Egypt Date of birth: 28.12.1963 Male	Person subject to judicial proceedings or an asset recovery process by the Egyptian authorities following a final court ruling in respect of the misappropriation of State Funds on the basis of the United Nations Convention against corruption.
6.	Khadiga Mahmoud El Gammal	Spouse of Mr Gamal Mahamed Hosni Elsayed Mubarak, son of former President of the Arab Republic of Egypt Date of birth: 13.10.1982 Female	Person subject to judicial proceedings or an asset recovery process by the Egyptian authorities following a final court ruling in respect of the misappropriation of State Funds on the basis of the United Nations Convention against corruption, and associated with Gamal Mohamed Hosni Elsayed Mubarak.

▼**M6**

	Name (and any aliases)	Identifying information	Grounds for designation
15.	Mohamed Zohir Mohamed Wahed Garrana	Former Minister of Tourism Date of birth: 20.2.1959 Male	Person subject to judicial proceedings by the Egyptian authorities in respect of the misappropriation of State Funds on the basis of the United Nations Convention against corruption.
18.	Habib Ibrahim Habib Eladli	Former Minister of Interior Date of birth: 1.3.1938 Male	Person subject to judicial proceedings by the Egyptian authorities in respect of the misappropriation of State Funds on the basis of the United Nations Convention against corruption.
19.	Elham Sayed Salem Sharshar	Spouse of Mr Habib Ibrahim Eladli Date of birth: 23.1.1963 Female	Person subject to judicial proceedings in respect of the misappropriation of State Funds on the basis of the United Nations Convention against corruption, and associated with Habib Ibrahim Eladli.

B. Rights of defence and right to effective judicial protection under Egyptian law:

The rights of defence and the right to effective judicial protection

It follows from Articles 54, 97 and 98 of the Egypt Constitution, Articles 77, 78, 124, 199, 214, 271, 272 and 277 of the Egypt Criminal Procedures Act and Articles 93 and 94 of the Egypt Advocacy Act (Law No 17 of 1983) that the following rights are guaranteed under Egyptian law:

— to any individual suspected of or charged with a criminal offence:

1. the right to judicial review of any act or administrative decision;

2. the right to defend himself/herself in person or through legal assistance of his/her own choosing or, if he/she has not sufficient means to pay for legal assistance, to be given it free when the interests of justice so require;

— to any individual charged with a criminal offence:

1. the right to be informed promptly, in a language which he/she understands and in detail, of the nature and cause of the accusation against him/her;

2. the right to have adequate time and facilities for the preparation of his/her defence;

3. the right to examine or have examined witnesses against him/her and to obtain the attendance and examination of witnesses on his/her behalf under the same conditions as witnesses against him/her;

4. the right to have the free assistance of an interpreter if he/she cannot understand or speak the language used in court.

Application of the rights of defence and the right to effective judicial protection

1. Mohamed Hosni Elsayed Mubarak

The information on the Council's file shows that the rights of defence and the right to effective judicial protection of Mr Mubarak were respected in the criminal proceedings on which the Council relied. This is demonstrated in particular as follows:

First case

▼M6

On 27 June 2013, Mr Mubarak was charged together with two other individuals with misappropriation of public funds and proceedings were initiated before the Cairo Criminal Court on 17 November 2013. On 21 May 2014, that Court convicted the three defendants. The defendants challenged this judgment before the Court of Cassation. On 13 January 2015, the Court of Cassation quashed the verdict and ordered a retrial. On retrial, on 4 and 29 April 2015, verbal and written pleadings of the parties were presented. On 9 May 2015, the Cairo Criminal Court convicted the defendants, ordered the restitution of the misappropriated funds and ordered the payment of a fine. On 24 May 2015, an appeal was lodged with the Court of Cassation. On 9 January 2016, the Court of Cassation upheld the convictions. On 8 March 2016, the defendants reached a settlement within the Experts Committee set up by Prime Ministerial Decree No 2873 of 2015. That settlement was approved by the Cabinet of Ministers on 9 March 2016. That settlement was not submitted to the Court of Cassation for final approval by the Prosecutor General because the Experts Committee was not the competent committee. It is open to the defendants to submit a request for settlement to the competent committee, the National Committee for Recovery of Assets Located Abroad (NCRAA).

Second case

The investigation relating to facts of misappropriation of public funds or assets is still ongoing. The Council has found no indication that the rights of defence or the right to effective judicial protection of Mr Mubarak were not respected.

3. Alaa Mohamed Hosni Elsayed Mubarak

The information on the Council's file shows that the rights of defence and the right to effective judicial protection of Mr Alaa Mubarak were respected in the criminal proceedings on which the Council relied. This is demonstrated in particular as follows:

Freezing order

On 28 February 2011, the Prosecutor General issued an order prohibiting Mr Alaa Mubarak and other individuals from disposing of their assets and funds in accordance with Article 208 bis/a of the Egypt Criminal Procedures Act, which allows the Prosecutor General to prohibit the defendant, his wife and his children from disposing of their assets if there are any doubts that such assets are the illegal proceeds of the crimes committed by that defendant. On 8 March 2011, the competent Criminal Court upheld the prohibition order. Pursuant to the laws of the Arab Republic of Egypt, defendants have the right to challenge the court ruling on the prohibition order before the same court. Mr Alaa Mubarak has not challenged the ruling of 8 March 2011.

First case

The defendant was referred together with another individual to the trial court (Cairo Criminal Court) on 30 May 2012. On 6 June 2013, the Court returned the case to the public prosecution for further investigations. After the conclusion of the investigations, the case was referred again to the Court. On 15 September 2018, the Cairo Criminal Court delivered a judgment by which: (i) it requested the expert committee it had appointed to complement the expert report it had submitted to the court in July 2018; (ii) ordered the arrest of the defendants; and (iii) asked to refer the defendants to the National Committee for Recovery of Assets Located Abroad (NCRAA) with a view to a possible reconciliation. The defendants successfully challenged the order of arrest and, following a motion of recusal of the judicial panel, the case was referred to another circuit of the criminal court to review the merits.

▼M6

Second case

On 27 June 2013, Mr Alaa Mubarak was charged together with two other individuals with misappropriation of public funds and proceedings were initiated before the Cairo criminal court on 17 November 2013. On 21 May 2014, that Court convicted the three defendants. The defendants challenged this judgment before the Court of Cassation. On 13 January 2015, the Court of Cassation quashed the verdict and ordered a retrial. On retrial, on 4 and 29 April 2015, verbal and written pleadings of the parties were presented.

On 9 May 2015, the Cairo Criminal Court convicted the defendants, ordered the restitution of the misappropriated funds and ordered the payment of a fine. On 24 May 2015, an appeal was lodged with the Court of Cassation. On 9 January 2016, the Court of Cassation upheld the convictions. On 8 March 2016, the defendants reached a settlement within the Experts Committee set up by Prime Ministerial Decree No 2873 of 2015. This settlement was approved by the Cabinet of Ministers on 9 March 2016. This settlement was not submitted to the Court of Cassation for final approval by the Prosecutor General because the Experts Committee was not the competent committee. It is open to the defendants to submit a request for settlement to the competent committee, the National Committee for Recovery of Assets Located Abroad (NCRAA).

Third case

The investigation relating to facts of misappropriation of public funds or assets is still ongoing. The Council has found no indication that the rights of the defence or the right to effective judicial protection of Mr Alaa Mubarak were not respected.

4. Heidy Mahmoud Magdy Hussein Rasekh

The information on the Council's file shows that the rights of defence and the right to effective judicial protection of Ms Rasekh were respected in the criminal proceedings on which the Council relied. This is demonstrated in particular as follows:

Freezing order

On 28 February 2011, the Prosecutor General issued an order prohibiting Ms Rasekh and other individuals from disposing of their assets and funds in accordance with Article 208 bis/a of the Egypt Criminal Procedures Act, which allows the Prosecutor General to prohibit the defendant, his wife and his children from disposing of their assets if there are any doubts that such assets are the illegal proceeds of the crimes committed by that defendant. On 8 March 2011, the competent Criminal Court upheld the prohibition order. Pursuant to the laws of the Arab Republic of Egypt, defendants have the right to challenge the court ruling on the prohibition order before the same court. Ms Rasekh has not challenged the ruling of 8 March 2011.

Case

The investigation relating to facts of misappropriation of public funds or assets is still ongoing The Council has found no indication that the rights of the defence or the right to effective judicial protection of Ms Rasekh were not respected.

5. Gamal Mohamed Hosni Elsayed Mubarak

The information on the Council's file shows that the rights of defence and the right to effective judicial protection of Mr Gamal Mubarak were respected in the criminal proceedings on which the Council relied. This is demonstrated in particular as follows:

▼M6

Freezing order

On 28 February 2011, the Prosecutor General issued an order prohibiting Mr Gamal Mubarak and other individuals from disposing of their assets and funds in accordance with Article 208 bis/a of the Egypt Criminal Procedures Act, which allows the Prosecutor General to prohibit the defendant, his wife and his children from disposing of their assets if there are any doubts that such assets are the illegal proceeds of the crimes committed by that defendant. On 8 March 2011, the competent criminal Court upheld the prohibition order. Pursuant to the laws of the Arab Republic of Egypt, defendants have the right to challenge the court ruling on the prohibition order before the same court. Mr Gamal Mubarak has not challenged the ruling of 8 March 2011.

First case

Mr Gamal Mubarak and another individual were referred to the trial court (Cairo Criminal Court) on 30 May 2012. On 6 June 2013, the Court returned the case to the public prosecution for further investigations. After the conclusion of the investigations, the case was referred again to the court. On 15 September 2018, the Cairo Criminal Court delivered a judgment by which: (i) it requested the expert committee it had appointed to complement the expert report it had submitted to the Court in July 2018; (ii) ordered the arrest of the defendants; and (iii) asked to refer the defendants to the National Committee for Recovery of Assets Located Abroad (NCRAA) with a view to a possible reconciliation. The defendants successfully challenged the order of arrest and, following a motion of recusal of the judicial panel, the case was referred to another circuit of the criminal court to review the merits.

Second case

On 27 June 2013, Mr Gamal Mubarak was charged together with two other individuals with misappropriation of public funds and proceedings were initiated before the Cairo Criminal Court on 17 November 2013. On 21 May 2014, that Court convicted the three defendants. The defendants challenged this judgment before the Court of Cassation. On 13 January 2015, the Court of Cassation quashed the verdict and ordered a retrial. On retrial, on 4 and 29 April 2015, verbal and written pleadings of the parties were presented. On 9 May 2015, the Cairo Criminal Court convicted the defendants, ordered the restitution of the misappropriated funds and ordered the payment of a fine. On 24 May 2015, an appeal was lodged with the Court of Cassation. On 9 January 2016, the Court of Cassation upheld the convictions. On 8 March 2016, the defendants reached a settlement within the Experts Committee set up by Prime Ministerial Decree No 2873 of 2015. This settlement was approved by the Cabinet of Ministers on 9 March 2016. This settlement was not submitted to the Court of Cassation for final approval by the Prosecutor General because the Experts Committee was not the competent committee. It is open to the defendants to submit a request for settlement to the competent committee, the National Committee for Recovery of Assets Located Abroad (NCRAA).

Third case

The investigation relating to facts of misappropriation of public funds or assets is still ongoing. In the course of the investigation proceedings Mr Gamal Mubarak has been questioned. The Council has found no indication that the rights of the defence or the right to effective judicial protection of Mr Gamal Mubarak were not respected.

6. Khadiga Mahmoud El Gammal

The information on the Council's file shows that the rights of defence and the right to effective judicial protection of Ms El Gammal were respected in the criminal proceedings on which the Council relied. This is demonstrated in particular as follows:

▼M6

Freezing order

On 28 February 2011, the Prosecutor General issued an order prohibiting Ms Khadiga El Gammal and other individuals from disposing of their assets and funds in accordance with Article 208 bis/a of the Egypt Criminal Procedures Act, which allows the Prosecutor General to prohibit the defendant, his wife and his children from disposing of their assets if there are any doubts that such assets are the illegal proceeds of the crimes committed by that defendant. On 8 March 2011, the competent criminal court upheld the prohibition order. Pursuant to the laws of the Arab Republic of Egypt, defendants have the right to challenge the court ruling on the prohibition order before the same court. Ms El Gammal has not challenged the ruling of 8 March 2011.

Case

The investigation relating to facts of misappropriation of public funds or assets is still ongoing. The Council has found no indication that the rights of defence or the right to effective judicial protection of Ms El Gammal were not respected.

15. Mohamed Zohir Mohamed Wahed Garrana

The information on the Council's file shows that the rights of defence and the right to effective judicial protection of Mr Garrana were respected in the criminal proceedings on which the Council relied. This is demonstrated in particular as follows:

Case

The investigation relating to facts of misappropriation of public funds or assets is still ongoing. The Council has found no indication that the rights of defence or the right to effective judicial protection of Mr Garrana were not respected.

18. Habib Ibrahim Habib Eladli

The information on the Council's file shows that the rights of defence and the right to effective judicial protection of Mr Eladli were respected in the criminal proceedings on which the Council relied. This is demonstrated in particular as follows:

Case

Mr Eladli was referred by the investigating judge to the competent trial court on charges of misappropriation of public funds. On 7 February 2016, that Court decided that the assets of Mr Eladli, his spouse and minor son should be frozen. Pursuant to that Court decision the Prosecutor General issued a freezing order on 10 February 2016 in accordance with Article 208 bis/a of the Egypt Criminal Procedures Act, which allows the Prosecutor General to prohibit the defendant, his wife and his children from disposing of their assets if there are any doubts that such assets are the illegal proceeds of the crimes committed by that defendant. Pursuant to the laws of the Arab Republic of Egypt, defendants have the right to challenge the court ruling on the prohibition order before the same court. On 15 April 2017, the Court convicted the defendant. The defendant challenged this judgment before the Court of Cassation, which quashed the verdict on 11 January 2018 and ordered a retrial. The new trial is still ongoing.

19. Elham Sayed Salem Sharshar

The information on the Council's file shows that the rights of defence and the right to effective judicial protection of Ms Sharshar were respected in the criminal proceedings on which the Council relied. This is demonstrated in particular as follows:

▼**M6**

Freezing order	
The husband of Ms Sharshar was referred by the investigating judge to the competent trial court on charges of misappropriation of public funds. On 7 February 2016, that Court decided that the assets of her husband, her own and those of their minor son should be frozen. Pursuant to that Court decision the Prosecutor General issued a freezing order on 10 February 2016 in accordance with Article 208 bis/a of the Egypt Criminal Procedures Act, which allows the Prosecutor General to prohibit the defendant, his wife and his children from disposing of their assets if there are any doubts that such assets are the illegal proceeds of the crimes committed by that defendant. Pursuant to the laws of the Arab Republic of Egypt, defendants have the right to challenge the court ruling on the prohibition order before the same court. Ms Sharshar has not challenged the Court ruling.	

▼B

ANNEX II

List of competent authorities in the Member States referred to in Articles 4(1) and 5(1), Article 7 and Article 9(1)(a) and address for notifications to the Commission

▼M7

BELGIUM

https://diplomatie.belgium.be/nl/Beleid/beleidsthemas/vrede_en_veiligheid/sancties

https://diplomatie.belgium.be/fr/politique/themes_politiques/paix_et_securite/sanctions

https://diplomatie.belgium.be/en/policy/policy_areas/peace_and_security/sanctions

BULGARIA

https://www.mfa.bg/en/101

CZECH REPUBLIC

www.financnianalytickyurad.cz/mezinarodni-sankce.html

DENMARK

http://um.dk/da/Udenrigspolitik/folkeretten/sanktioner/

GERMANY

http://www.bmwi.de/DE/Themen/Aussenwirtschaft/aussenwirtschaftsrecht,did=404888.html

ESTONIA

http://www.vm.ee/est/kat_622/

IRELAND

http://www.dfa.ie/home/index.aspx?id=28519

GREECE

http://www.mfa.gr/en/foreign-policy/global-issues/international-sanctions.html

SPAIN

http://www.exteriores.gob.es/Portal/en/PoliticaExteriorCooperacion/GlobalizacionOportunidadesRiesgos/Paginas/SancionesInternacionales.aspx

FRANCE

http://www.diplomatie.gouv.fr/fr/autorites-sanctions/

CROATIA

http://www.mvep.hr/sankcije

ITALY

https://www.esteri.it/mae/it/politica_estera/politica_europea/misure_deroghe

CYPRUS

http://www.mfa.gov.cy/mfa/mfa2016.nsf/mfa35_en/mfa35_en?OpenDocument

LATVIA

http://www.mfa.gov.lv/en/security/4539

LITHUANIA

http://www.urm.lt/sanctions

LUXEMBOURG

https://maee.gouvernement.lu/fr/directions-du-ministere/affaires-europeennes/mesures-restrictives.html

▼**M7**

HUNGARY

http://www.kormany.hu/download/9/2a/f0000/EU%20szankci%C3%B3s%20t%C3%A1j%C3%A9koztat%C3%B3_20170214_final.pdf

MALTA

https://foreignaffairs.gov.mt/en/Government/SMB/Pages/Sanctions-Monitoring-Board.aspx

NETHERLANDS

https://www.rijksoverheid.nl/onderwerpen/internationale-sancties

AUSTRIA

http://www.bmeia.gv.at/view.php3?f_id=12750&LNG=en&version=

POLAND

https://www.gov.pl/web/dyplomacja

PORTUGAL

http://www.portugal.gov.pt/pt/ministerios/mne/quero-saber-mais/sobre-o-ministerio/medidas-restritivas/medidas-restritivas.aspx

ROMANIA

http://www.mae.ro/node/1548

SLOVENIA

http://www.mzz.gov.si/si/omejevalni_ukrepi

SLOVAKIA

https://www.mzv.sk/europske_zalezitosti/europske_politiky-sankcie_eu

FINLAND

http://formin.finland.fi/kvyhteistyo/pakotteet

SWEDEN

http://www.ud.se/sanktioner

UNITED KINGDOM

https://www.gov.uk/sanctions-embargoes-and-restrictions

Address for notifications to the European Commission:

European Commission
Service for Foreign Policy Instruments (FPI)
EEAS 07/99
B-1049 Brussels, Belgium
E-mail: relex-sanctions@ec.europa.eu