

DAY FINES IN EUROPE

Day fines, as a pecuniary sanction, have a great potential to reduce inequality in the criminal sentencing system, as they impose the same relative punishment on all offenders irrespective of their income. Furthermore, with correct implementation, they can constitute an alternative sanction to the more repressive and not always efficient short-term prison sentences. Finally, by independently expressing in the sentence the severity and the income of the offender, day fines can increase uniformity and transparency of sentencing. Having this in mind, almost half of the European Union countries have adopted day fines in their criminal justice system. For the first time, this book makes their findings accessible to a wider international audience. Aimed at scholars, policy makers and criminal law practitioners, it provides an opportunity to learn about the theoretical advantages, the practical challenges, the successes and failures, and ways to improve.

Elena Kantorowicz-Reznichenko is a Professor of Quantitative Empirical Legal Studies at the Rotterdam Institute of Law and Economics, Erasmus School of Law, Erasmus University Rotterdam. As an expert on day fines, she has published widely on the topic in international journals and served as an expert advisor to Ministries in different countries that considered the implementation of day fines.

Michael Faure is a Professor of Comparative and International Environmental Law at Maastricht University and Professor of Comparative Private Law and Economics at Erasmus School of Law. He is member of the board of the European Centre of Tort and Insurance Law (Vienna) and a member of the Royal Netherlands Academy of Arts and Sciences.





Day Fines in Europe

ASSESSING INCOME-BASED SANCTIONS IN CRIMINAL JUSTICE SYSTEMS

Edited by

ELENA KANTOROWICZ-REZNICHENKO

Erasmus University Rotterdam

MICHAEL FAURE

Maastricht University

With the cooperation of

MARIANNE BREIJER

Erasmus University Rotterdam





CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS

University Printing House, Cambridge CB2 8BS, United Kingdom One Liberty Plaza, 20th Floor, New York, NY 10006, USA 477 Williamstown Road, Port Melbourne, VIC 3207, Australia 314–321, 3rd Floor, Plot 3, Splendor Forum, Jasola District Centre, New Delhi – 110025, India

79 Anson Road, #06-04/06, Singapore 079906

Cambridge University Press is part of the University of Cambridge.

It furthers the University's mission by disseminating knowledge in the pursuit of education, learning, and research at the highest international levels of excellence.

www.cambridge.org
Information on this title: www.cambridge.org/9781108490832
DOI: 10.1017/9781108855020

© Cambridge University Press 2021

This publication is in copyright. Subject to statutory exception and to the provisions of relevant collective licensing agreements, no reproduction of any part may take place without the written permission of Cambridge University Press.

First published 2021

A catalogue record for this publication is available from the British Library.

ISBN 978-1-108-49083-2 Hardback ISBN 978-1-108-79643-9 Paperback

Cambridge University Press has no responsibility for the persistence or accuracy of URLs for external or third-party internet websites referred to in this publication and does not guarantee that any content on such websites is, or will remain, accurate or appropriate.



Contents

List	of Figi	ıres	page xi
List	of Tab	les	xiii
List	of Cor	atributors	XV
Ackı	10wled	gements	xvii
List	of Abb	reviations	xviii
1		duction 1 Kantorowicz-Reznichenko and Michael Faure	1
	1.1 1.2 1.3 Refer	Introduction Day Fines Around the World Synopsis and structure ences	1 3 5 7
2		retical Perspectives on Day Fines Kantorowicz-Reznichenko	8
	2.1 2.2 2.3 2.4 Refer	Introduction Justifications of Punishment and Day Fines Theoretically Optimal Day Fine Model Conclusion ences	8 9 18 21 22
3	•	Fines in Finland o Lahti	24
	3.1	Historical Development of Day Fines in Finland and Their Legislative Reasons Contents of the Provisions on Day Fines, Conversion	24
		Sentences and the Enforcement of Imposed Fines	27

V



vi Contents

	3.3	Practical Implementation of the Day Fine System	32
	3.4	Public Perception of Day Fines	39
	3.5	Actual Challenges of the Fining System	39
	3.6	Conclusion	41
	Refer	ences	42
4	-	Fines in Sweden Öberg	44
	4.1 4.2	Introduction Historical Development of Day Fines in the Swedish	44
		Legal System	45
	4.3	The Legal Framework of Day Fines	48
	4.4	Practical Implementation of the Day Fine System	56
	4·5 4.6	Public Perception and Criticism of the Day Fine System Special Challenges: Switching to Day Fines from Short	61
		Imprisonment Sentences	63
	4.7	Conclusions: Day Fines As an Alternative Criminal	
		Sanction	65
	Refer	ences	67
5	Day I	Fines in Denmark	70
	Thom	as Elholm	,
	5.1	Historical Development of Day Fines in the Country	70
	5.2	The Legal Framework and the Structure of Day Fines	, 72
	5.3	The Practical Implementation of Day Fines	₇ 6
	5.4	Public Perception of Day Fines	82
	5.5	Special Challenges	83
	Refer	ences	84
6	Day I	Fines in Germany	85
U	•	Joerg Albrecht	٠,
	6.1	Historical Development of Day Fines in Germany	85
	6.2	The Comprehensive Criminal Law Reform, Day Fines	٠,
	0.2	and the System of Criminal Penalties	88
	6.3	The Structure of Day Fines and Fining	
	6.4	Implementing the Day Fine System	94
	6.5	Public Opinion and Day Fines	101
	6.6	Challenges	112
	Refer	9	115
	IVELEL	CHCCS	117



	Contents	V11
7	Day Fines in Austria Christopher Kahl and Verena Weinberger	122
	 7.1 Historical Development of Day Fines in Austria 7.2 The Structure of the Fine 7.3 The Practical Implementation of Day Fines 7.4 Public Perception of Day Fines 7.5 Conclusion References 	122 123 136 142 144
8	Day Fines in Hungary Csaba Győry	146
	 8.1 Historical Development of Day Fines in Hungary 8.2 The Legal Framework for Day Fines 8.3 Practical Implementation 8.4 Conclusion References 	146 148 159 162 165
9	Day Fines in France Bruno Deffains and Jean-Baptiste Thierry	167
	 9.1 Historical Development of Day Fines in France 9.2 Legal Framework for Day Fines 9.3 Practical Implementation of Day Fines 9.4 Statistical Elements 9.5 Evaluation References 	167 169 174 175 177
10	Day Fines in Portugal Maria Fernanda Palma and Helena Morão	181
	 10.1 Historical Development of the Day Fine Model in Portugal 10.2 The Legal Framework of Day Fines 10.3 The Practical Implementation of Day Fines 10.4 Public Perception of Day Fines 10.5 Constitutionality Challenges References 	181 186 190 192 193
11	Day (Unit) Fines in England and Wales Valsamis Mitsilegas and Foivi Sofia Mouzakiti	195
	11.1 Historical Development of Day Fines in England and Wales	106



viii Contents

	11.2	The Legal Framework of Unit Fines	200
	11.3	Practical Implementation of Unit Fines	204
	11.4	Public Perception of Unit Fines	208
	11.5	Special Challenges	210
	11.6	Conclusion	212
	Refer	ences	213
12	Day l	Fines in Slovenia	216
	Mitja	Kovac	
	12.1	Introduction	216
	12.2	Historical Development of Day Fines in the Country	217
	12.3	The Structure of the Fine	223
	12.4	Practical Implementation	226
	12.5	Public Perception of Day Fines	232
	12.6	Special Challenges	234
	12.7	Conclusions	235
	Refer	ences	236
13	-	Fines in Spain Barquín Sanz	238
		·	0
	13.1	Introduction: Fines in Spanish Criminal Law	238
	13.2	Historical Development of Day Fines in Spain	240
		Legal Framework	241
		Practical Implementation	246
		Public Perception	²⁵⁷
	13.6	Other Challenges	260
	Keier	ences	261
14	-	Fines in Poland d Marko and Sławomir Steinborn	263
			-6-
	14.1	Historical Development of Day Fines in Poland	263 266
	14.2	The Legal Framework of Day Fines	
	14.3	The Practical Implementation of Day Fines	272
	14.4 D. C	The Public Perception of Day Fines	281
	Refer	ences	282
15	•	Fines in Croatia Munivrana Vajda	284
	15.1	Historical Development of Day Fines in Croatia	284
	15.2	The Structure of the Fine	289



		Contents	ix
	15.3 15.4 15.5 Refer	Practical Implementation of Day Fines Public Perception of Day Fines Special Challenges ences	297 301 302 303
16	•	Fines in Switzerland in Killias and Lorenz Biberstein	306
		Introduction Monetary Penalties As an Alternative to Custodial	306
	16.3 16.4	A Major Problem Denied: Monetary Penalties	306 311
		Converted into Custody Policy Implications ences	316 321 323
17	•	Fines in Czech Republic indl and Jan Kupčík	3 2 4
	17.1 17.2 17.3 17.4 17.5 Refer	Historical Development of Day Fines in the Country The Legal Framework of Day Fines The Practical Implementation of Day Fines Public Perception of Day Fines Special challenges ences	324 327 334 341 343 344
18	-	Fines in Romania til Udroiu	346
	18.2 18.3 18.4 18.5	Historical Development of Day Fines in Romania The Legal Framework for Day Fines The Practical Implementation of Day Fines Public Perception of Day Fines Special Challenges eences	346 349 355 362 363 365
19	on D	parative Law and Economics Perspective ay Fines a Kantorowicz-Reznichenko and Michael Faure	366
	19.1 19.2 19.3	Introduction A Comparative View Theory versus Practice	366 367



X	Contents	
19	4 Best Practices and Limitations	375
19.	5 Policy Implications	381
19.0	6 Concluding Remarks	386
Ref	ferences	388
Index		389



Figures

6.1	Prosecutor's decisions 2017 % (N 1,887,668)	bage 93
6.2	The structure of criminal sanctions 1960–2017	102
6.3	Fine collection initiated (right Y-axis), community service %,	
	default imprisonment % (both left Y-axis)	109
6.4	Reconviction rates after fines, suspended prison sentences and	
	imprisonment	111
7.1	Ratio fines/imprisonment	137
7.2	Number of daily units imposed – non-suspended monetary	
	fines	139
7.3	Number of daily units imposed – partially suspended	
	monetary fines	140
7.4	Overview of convictions in different court districts	140
7.5	Level of recidivism	142
8.1	Distribution of the number of daily units per year	160
8.2	Distribution of the amount of daily units per year	161
8.3	Distribution of the total amount of the day fines per year	161
13.1	Portion of fine sentences of total sentences (1975–2003)	² 54
13.2	Portion of fine sentences and prison sentences of total sentence	es
	(2008–17)	256
13.3	Fine sentences, prison sentences and total sentences (2008–17)	259
14.1	Day fines in 2018 by the number of daily units	278
14.2	Day fines in 2018 by daily units	278
4.3	Enforcement of the fine – closed cases in the years 2014–18	280
16.1	Total suspended and unsuspended custodial sentences	
	not exceeding six months 2002–18, for all offences	312
6.2	Convictions for misdemeanours and felonies by type	
	of principal sanction 1984–2014	312



xii	List of Figures	
16.3	Execution of sentences and measures: average number	
	of inmates by principal sanction 1984–2018	314
16.4	Prison admissions following the conversion of monetary	
	sanctions into custody, 1984–2018	215



Tables

3.1	The distribution of penalties in 2017	page 32
3.2	Number and amount of the day fines and the portion of the	
	minimum day fines in 2008–17	33
3.3	Total amount of day fines in 2008–17	34
3.4	The distribution of the total amounts of imposed day fines	
	in 2017	35
3.5	The use of fines in Europe 2006	36
3.6	The use of fines and other sanctions in assault and theft	
	offences in Europe 2006	38
6.1	Structure of criminal sanctions 2017, % column and total,	
	() row %	103
6.2	Selected offence categories and the share of day fines 2002–17	105
6.3	Day fine units by day fine size % (in () row percentages)	106
6.4	The German public's penalty preferences for burglary	
	1989/2005 and sentences for burglary 2005	113
6.5	Penalty preferences and sentences imposed for selected offence	
	categories 2017	115
8.1	Number and percentage of day fine sanctions per year	160
8.2	The amount and number of daily units of day fines imposed	
	for offences with the special intent of pecuniary gain in 2017	162
8.3	Offences with the highest percentage of day fines among the tot	al
	number of imposed sanctions and most frequent alternatives	
	to day fines in 2017	163
9.1	Penalties imposed 2006–17	176
12.1	Annual amount of criminal offences and day fines	
	(convicted adults)	229
13.1	Portion of fine sentences of total sentences (1975–2003)	² 54

xiii



xiv List of Tables

13.2	Portion of fine sentences and prison sentences of total	
	sentences (2008–17)	256
13.3	Fine sentences, prison sentences and total sentences (2008–17)	258
14.1	Adults validly sentenced by common courts by type	
	of punishment in the years 1997 and 1999–2018	274
14.2	Size of the fines imposed in the years 2002–17 by the amount	277
15.1	Percentage of unsuspended punishments 1998–2012	287
15.2	Adult perpetrators: criminal complaints, convictions,	
	punishments 2013–18	298
15.3	The total number and percentage of ancillary fines	300
16.1	Kind of final settlement by type of monetary penalty	318
	Summary of the Day Fine Models	268



Contributors

HANS-JÖRG ALBRECHT, (emeritus) Max Planck Institute for the Study of Crime, Security and Law, Freiburg, as well as University of Freiburg, Germany.

JESÚS BARQUÍN SANZ, University of Granada, Spain.

LORENZ BIBERSTEIN, Zurich University of Applied Sciences, Switzerland.

BRUNO DEFFAINS, University Paris 2 Pantheon Assas, France.

THOMAS ELHOLM, University of Copenhagen, Denmark.

MICHAEL FAURE, Maastricht University and Erasmus University Rotterdam, the Netherlands.

CSABA GYŐRY, Hungarian Academy of Sciences, Centre for Social Sciences, Institute of Legal Studies, Budapest, Hungary.

CHRISTOPHER KAHL, Vienna University of Business and Economics, Austria, under the direction of Robert Kert.

ELENA KANTOROWICZ-REZNICHENKO, Erasmus University Rotterdam, the Netherlands.

MARTIN KILLIAS, (emeritus) Universities of Zurich, Lausanne and St. Gallen, Switzerland.

JIŘÍ KINDL, Skils s.r.o. law firm, as well as Charles University, Prague, Czech Republic.

мітја коvac, University of Ljubljana, Slovenia.

JAN KUPČÍK, Skils s.r.o. law firm, as well as Masaryk University, Brno, Czech Republic.

RAIMO LAHTI, (emeritus) University of Helsinki, Finland.

DAWID MARKO, University of Gdansk, Poland.



xvi

List of Contributors

HELENA MORÃO, University of Lisbon (Universidade de Lisboa), Research Centre of Criminal Law and Criminal Sciences (CIDPCC, supported by FCT), Portugal.

VALSAMIS MITSILEGAS, Queen Mary University of London, United Kingdom. FOIVI SOFIA MOUZAKITI, Royal Holloway, University of London, United Kingdom.

MAJA MUNIVRANA VAJDA, University of Zagreb, Croatia.

JACOB ÖBERG, Örebro University, Sweden.

MARIA FERNANDA PALMA, University of Lisbon (Universidade de Lisboa), Research Centre of Criminal Law and Criminal Sciences (CIDPCC, supported by FCT), Portugal.

SLAWOMIR STEINBORN, University of Gdansk, Poland.

JEAN-BAPTISTE THIERRY, University of Lorraine, France.

MIHAIL UDROIU, Court of Appel Oradea, Romania.

VERENA WEINBERGER, Vienna University of Business and Economics, Austria, under the direction of Robert Kert.



Acknowledgements

This book is the result of a collaboration with reporters from many countries. They were asked to draft chapters according to a particular format in order to guarantee the comparability of the chapters. Drafts of the chapters were presented at an international conference organised at Erasmus School of Law Rotterdam on 26 June 2019. We acknowledge financial support for the organisation of that conference from the research programme Behavioural Approaches to Contract and Tort; the Erasmus University Rotterdam Innovation Programme Dynamics of Inclusive Prosperity and the Erasmus Trustfund. We are especially grateful to all authors of the country reports for their willingness to draft chapters under a tight schedule and for their agreement to incorporate comments received during the conference and from the editors.

As editors of this book, we are equally grateful to Marianne Breijer who, as a project manager, supported the entire research project. Marianne also critically examined all chapters and provided invaluable editorial support. We are also grateful to Vera Breijer for her help in harmonising texts, footnotes and references in preparation of the publication of this volume.



Abbreviations

BCCRC Basis Criminal Code of the Republic of Croatia

CC Criminal Code

CCP Code of Criminal Procedure
CEC Criminal Enforcement Code
CEO Chief executive officer
CFC Criminal Fiscal Code

CJA Criminal Justice Act

CP Código Penal (Spanish Penal Code)

CPC Code of Civil Procedure

CSK zechoslovak koruna (Czechoslovak koruna)

CZK Czech koruna (Czech koruna)
DKK Dansk krone (Danish krone)
ECLI European Case Law Identifier

FINA Financijska Agencija (Financial Agency) FinStrG Finanzstrafgesetz (Act on Fiscal Offences)

HC Deb House of Commons Debates HL Deb House of Lords Debates

HRD Hrvatski dinar (Croatian dinar) HRK Hrvatska kuna (Croatian kuna)

IAS Indexante dos Apoios Sociais (Indexing reference of social

support)

ICS International Crime Survey

ICVS International Crime Victims Survey

INE Instituto Nacional de Estadística (Spanish Statistical Office)

LEC Ley de Enjuiciamiento Civil (Civil Procedure Act)

LECr Ley de Enjuiciamiento Criminal (Criminal Procedure Act)

NIP Taxpayer Identification Number (Poland)

NJA Nytt Juridiskt Arkiv (Cases from the Swedish Supreme Court)

xviii



Cambridge University Press 978-1-108-49083-2 — Day Fines in Europe Edited by Elena Kantorowicz-Reznichenko, Michael Faure Frontmatter **More Information**

List of Abbreviations

xix

OIB	Osobni identifikacijski broj (personal identification number)
	(Croatia)
OLG	Oberlandesgericht (Higher Regional Court of Appeal)
PC	Penal Code
PLN	Polski złoty (Polish Złoty)
RON	Romanian new leu / lei (Romanian currency)
SAN	Sentencia de la Audiencia Nacional (Decision of the National
	Court)
SAP	Sentencia de la Audiencia Provincial (Decision of the Provincial
	Court)
SCC	Swiss Criminal Code
SFRY	Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia
SIT	Slovenian tolar
SORS	Statistical Office of the Republic of Slovenia
STS	Sentencia del Tribunal Supremo (Decision of the Supreme
	Court)
StG	Strafgesetz (Criminal Statute)
StGB	Strafgesetzbuch (Criminal Code)
StPO	Strafprozessordnung (Code of Criminal Procedure)
StVG	Strafvollzugsgesetz (Criminal Executive Code)
VbVG	Verbandsverantwortlichkeitsgesetz (Act on the Responsibility of
	Legal Entities)
VStG	Verwaltungsstrafgesetz (Act on Administrative Offences)

