

Brussels, 10 October 2019

**To: The President of the European Parliament**  
**Cc: The Chair of the Committee on Legal Affairs**  
**Cc: Vice-Chairs of the Committee on Legal Affairs**

**From: François Alfonsi (Greens/EFA), Petra de Sutter (Greens/EFA), Clare Daly (GUE/NGL), Mick Wallace (GUE/NGL), Luke Ming Flanagan (GUE/NGL), Stasys Jakeliunas (Greens/EFA), Anne Sophie Pelletier (GUE/NGL), Leila Chaibi (GUE/NGL), Benoit Biteau (Greens/EFA), Kate ina Kone ná (GUE/NGL), Tatjana Zdanoka (Greens/EFA), Johan Van Overtveldt (ECR), Nikolaj Villumsen (GUE/NGL), Margrete Auken (Greens/EFA), Alyn Smith (Greens/EFA), Geert Bourgeois (ECR), Milan Brglez (SD), Monika Vana (Greens/EFA), Marisa Matias (GUE/NGL), Marketa Gregorova (Greens/EFA), Nico Semsrott (Greens/EFA), Jill Evans (Greens/EFA), Martin Sonneborn (NI), Assita Kanko (ECR), Christian Allard (Greens/EFA), Ozlem Demirel (GUE/NGL), Manon Aubry (GUE/NGL), Mislav Kolakuši (NI), Damien Carêm (Greens/EFA), Manuel Bompard (GUE/NGL), Matt Carthy (GUE/NGL), Martina Anderson (GUE/NGL), Fernando Barrera (GUE/NGL), Francisco Guerreiro (Greens/EFA), José Gusmao (GUE/NGL), Aileen McLeod (Greens/EFA), Izaskun Bilbao (Renew Europe), Diana Riba i Giner (Greens/EFA) on behalf of Carles Puigdemont, Oriol Junqueras and Antoni Comín**

Subject: Request for the defence of the immunities of Mr. Carles Puigdemont i Casamajó, Mr. Oriol Junqueras i Vies, and Mr. Antoni Comín i Oliveres, elected Members of the European Parliament (Rule 9 of the Rules of Procedure)

- having regard to Article 2 of the Treaty of the European Union (TEU),
- having regard to Article 343 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union (TFEU),
- having regard to Article 39 of the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union (the Charter),
- having regard to the Protocol No 7 on the Privileges and Immunities of the European Union (Protocol No 7),
- having regard to the Act of 20 September 1976 concerning the election of the members of the European Parliament by direct universal suffrage (the Electoral Act),
- having regard to Article 3(2) of the European Council Decision (EU) 2018/937 of 28 June 2018 establishing the composition of the European Parliament, in connection to Article 3 of the European Council Decision 2013/312/EU of 28 June 2013,
- having regard to Article 3 of Protocol No 1 to the European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR),
- having regard to Articles 23 and 71(2) of the Spanish Constitution,
- having regard to Article 224 of the Spanish Electoral Law,
- having regard to Article 20(2) of the Rules of Procedure of the Spanish Parliament,

- having regard to the Court of Justice of the European Union (CJEU) judgment of 15 October 2018 (*Ashley Neil Mote v European Parliament*),<sup>1</sup>
- having regard to the CJEU judgment of 6 October 2015 (*Thierry Delvigne v Commune de Lesparre Médoc and Préfet de la Gironde*)<sup>2</sup>,
- having regard to the CJEU judgment of 13 January 2013 (*Bruno Gollnisch v European Parliament*),<sup>3</sup>
- having regard to the CJEU judgment of 30 April 2009 (*Beniamino Donnici v European Parliament*),<sup>4</sup>
- having regard to the CJEU judgment of 21 October 2008 (*Alfonso Luigi Marra v Eduardo De Gregorio and Antonio Clemente*),<sup>5</sup>
- having regard to the Opinion of Advocate General Jääskinen of 9 June 2011 (*Patriciello*),<sup>6</sup>
- having regard to Opinion No. 6/2019 of the United Nations Working Group on Arbitrary Detentions of 26 April 2019,
- having regard to the introductory memorandum of the Committee on Legal Affairs and Human Rights of the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe (Mr. Boris Cilevi s) of 1 October 2019,
- having regard to the Olteanu report of the Committee on Rules of Procedure and Immunities of the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe, Immunities of Members of the Parliamentary Assembly,
- having regard to the Working Paper of the Directorate-General for Research of the European Parliament ‘*Parliamentary Immunity in the Member States of the European Union and in the European Parliament*’,<sup>7</sup>
- having regard to the Orders of the Spanish Supreme Court of 14 and 15 June 2019 on case 20907/2017,
- having regard to the Decision of the High Court of Schleswig-Holstein (Germany) of 12 July 2018,
- having regard to the Order of the Spanish Constitutional Court 13/2000 of 11 January 2000.

---

<sup>1</sup> Judgment of the Court of First Instance (Seventh Chamber) of 15 October 2008, ECLI:EU:T:2008:440

<sup>2</sup> Judgment of the Court (Grand Chamber) of 6 October 2015, ECLI:EU:C:2015:648

<sup>3</sup> Judgment of the Court (First Chamber) of 17 January 2013, ECLI:EU:T:2013:23

<sup>4</sup> Judgment of the Court (Fourth Chamber) of 30 April 2009, ECLI:EU:C:2009:44

<sup>5</sup> Judgment of the Court (Grand Chamber) of 21 October 2008, ECLI:EU:C:2008:579

<sup>6</sup> Opinion of Advocate General Jääskinen of 9 June 2011, ECLI:EU:C:2011:379

<sup>7</sup> Parliamentary Immunity in the Member States of the European Union and in the European Parliament, *Legal Affairs Series* (PE 168.399), page 179. Cited in the Conclusions of the Advocate General Advocate-General Jääskinen in *Patriciello* (Case C-163/10)

- having regard to the results of the election to the European Parliament of 26 May 2019 officially declared by the competent Spanish authorities, published at the Spanish Official Gazette on 14 June 2019,<sup>8</sup>
  - having regard to the Decision of the European Parliament on the request of upholding of the immunity and privileges of Francesco Musotto, based on the Zimeray report (2002/2201(IMM)),
  - having regard to the Donnez report of the Committee of Legal Affairs of the European Parliament (A2-121/86) of 10 October 1986,
  - having regard to Rules 5(2), 7 and 9(2) of the Rules of Procedure of the European Parliament,
- A. whereas Carles Puigdemont i Casamajó, Oriol Junqueras i Vies and Antoni Comín i Oliveres were officially declared elected Members of the European Parliament by the competent Spanish authorities on 13 June 2019, and such declaration was published in the Spanish Official Gazette on 14 June 2019;
  - B. whereas according to the case law of the Spanish Constitutional Court, the official proclamation of results is the final step of the national electoral procedure<sup>9</sup> and, according to Article 12 of the 1976 Electoral Act, Parliament has the obligation to take note of the results declared officially by the Member States;
  - C. whereas according to Article 39 of the Charter, Article 10(3) of the Treaty on the European Union, the 1976 Electoral Act and the Spanish Electoral Law, Carles Puigdemont i Casamajó, Oriol Junqueras i Vies and Antoni Comín i Oliveres enjoy all their political rights;
  - D. whereas the Spanish Electoral Commission has interpreted Article 224(2) of the Spanish Electoral Law as requiring elected Members, after their proclamation, to appear personally in Madrid to take an oath of allegiance to the Spanish Constitution;
  - E. whereas on 15 June 2019 the investigative judge of the Criminal Chamber of the Spanish Supreme Court decided not to withdraw the existing national arrest warrants against Carles Puigdemont i Casamajó and Antoni Comín i Oliveres, following their election as new Members of the European Parliament, so that they could be sworn in and take their seats with effect from the opening of the first sitting following the elections;
  - F. whereas on 12 July 2018 the High Court of Schleswig-Holstein (Germany) declared inadmissible the extradition sought by the Spanish Supreme Court (through a European Arrest Warrant) of Carles Puigdemont i Casamajó on charges of rebellion and sedition;
  - G. whereas on 17 June 2019 the Spanish Electoral Commission refused Carles Puigdemont i Casamajó and Antoni Comín i Oliveres' pledge of allegiance to the Spanish Constitution through a written statement done in front of a public notary, pursuant to Spanish Electoral Law.

---

<sup>8</sup> [Decision](#) published on 14 June 2019 at the Spanish Official Gazette

<sup>9</sup> Order of the Spanish Constitutional Court 13/2000, of 11 January 2000.

- H. whereas Oriol Junqueras i Vies requested permission to the Supreme Court to leave prison to appear before the Spanish Electoral Commission to take the said pledge and the Court denied him such a permission;
- I. whereas the Supreme Court did allow Oriol Junqueras i Vies to leave prison to swear or affirm allegiance to the Spanish Constitution when he was elected in the Spanish elections held on 28 April 2019, in which Oriol Junqueras i Vies was leading the list of Esquerra Republicana and was elected Member of the Spanish Parliament;
- J. whereas on 17 September 2019 Oriol Junqueras i Vias communicated to the Spanish electoral authority the formulation of the oath to the Spanish Constitution in the form of a declaration in front of a public notary;
- K. whereas on 26 April 2019 the United Nations Working Group on Arbitrary Detention issued the Opinion No. 6/2019 which confirmed that the charges of rebellion, sedition and misuse of public funds brought by the Spanish Supreme Court against Oriol Junqueras i Vies, and others, 'were aimed at justifying their detention as a result of the exercise of their rights to freedom of opinion, expression, association, assembly and political participation, in contravention of Articles 18 to 21 of the Universal Declaration and Articles 19, 21, 22 and 25 of the Covenant, so it is arbitrary';
- L. whereas the charges analysed by the Working Group on Arbitrary Detention or High Court of Schleswig-Holstein are the result of the same criminal investigation and are also the grounds for the arrest warrants issued against Antoni Comín i Oliveres;
- M. whereas the introductory memorandum of the Committee on Legal Affairs and Human Rights of the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe (Mr. Boris Cilevi s) of 1 October 2019 questioned the criminal prosecution of elected Members of the European Parliament Carles Puigdemont i Casamajó, Oriol Junqueras i Vies and Antoni Comín i Oliveres, among others;
- N. whereas on 17 June 2019, the Spanish Electoral Commission sent to the European Parliament an incomplete list of the elected Members but without the names of Carles Puigdemont i Casamajó, Oriol Junqueras i Vies and Antoni Comín i Oliveres;
- O. whereas on 2 July 2019, all the elected Members of the European Parliament had the right, pursuant to Article 5 of the 1976 Electoral Act and Rule 3(1) of the Rules of Procedure, to be present at the opening of the first sitting of the European Parliament which took place in Strasbourg;
- P. whereas since Carles Puigdemont i Casamajó, Oriol Junqueras i Vies and Antoni Comín i Oliveres were excluded from the list that the Spanish authorities sent to the European Parliament, the European Parliament was constituted with only 748 members, instead of 751 as laid down in the European Council Decision 2013/312/EU establishing the composition of the European Parliament;
- Q. whereas on 20 June 2019 Carles Puigdemont i Casamajó and Antoni Comín i Oliveres requested to the President of the European Parliament to take all necessary measures, as a matter of urgency, pursuant to Rule 8(1) of the Rules of Procedure, after consulting the Chair of the Committee on Legal Affairs, to assert the privileges and immunities we enjoy as elected Members of the European Parliament;

- R. whereas the President of the Parliament failed to consult the Chair of the Committee on Legal Affairs on the issue and gave no specific reply to that letter;
- S. whereas on 4 July 2019 Diana Riba i Giner, Member of the European Parliament, requested to the President of the European Parliament to activate the procedure laid down in Rule 8 of the Rules of Procedure and take urgent action to assert the immunity of Oriol Junqueras i Vies;
- T. whereas on 22 August 2019 the President of the European Parliament declared in a written answer to Diana Riba i Giner, Member of the European Parliament, that he was not competent to examine such a request;
- U. whereas the CJEU judgment of 21 October 2008 on the *Marra* case provides that ‘where the national court is informed of the fact that a Member has made a request to the European Parliament for defence of that immunity (...) it must stay the judicial proceedings and request the European Parliament to issue its opinion as soon as possible’;
- V. whereas the immunity conferred in the second paragraph of Article 9 should be regarded as a Union immunity, irrespective of the protection accorded by national legislation;
1. The provisions of Article 9 of Protocol No 7 refer to the ‘immunities accorded to members of their parliament’, which must be interpreted as a reference to the substantive dimension of immunity and not to its procedural aspects. That is, taking into account the scope of immunity at the national level (for instance, criminal responsibility or other liabilities such as civil or administrative ones, or whether it exists areas excluded from immunity by reason of criminal offences), as well as the type of guarantee in which immunity is based; specifically, whether the country’s immunity requires a parliamentary authorization through a request for waiver of immunity. In the case of Spain, the reference in Protocol No 7 to the immunities recognized to the Members of the Spanish Parliament should be understood in the same way, that is, that such immunity exists only in the field of criminal law, without any exception of criminal offences, and it can only be suspended through parliamentary authorization.
  2. In addition, Article 71(2) of the Spanish Constitution provides that ‘during their terms of office, Members of the Congress and Senators shall likewise enjoy immunity and may only be arrested in the event of delicto flagrante. They may be neither indicted nor tried without prior authorisation of the respective Houses’ and Article 20(2) of the Rules of Procedure of the Spanish Parliament provides that ‘rights and privileges are effective since the precise moment in which Members are declared to be elected’.
  3. The Donnez and Zimeray reports argue that European immunity is effective from the proclamation of the election results, in such a way that elected MEPs should be also protected when completing whatever procedural requirements deemed necessary to take up their seats in Parliament.
  4. Indeed, the European Parliament’s position has been consistent in the sense that, in view of its purpose, Articles 8 and 9 of the Protocol No 7 must be interpreted in such a way that those provisions are effective from the time of publication of the results of the elections to the European Parliament. In particular the Decision of the European Parliament on the request for upholding of the immunity and privileges of Francesco Musotto based on the

Zimeray report, confirmed that 'in view of its purpose, Articles 9 and 10 [current Articles 8 and 9] of Protocol No 7 must be interpreted in such a way that these provisions are effective from the time of publication of the results of the elections to the European Parliament'.

5. The Opinion of Advocate-General Jääskinen in *Patriciello* provided that 'there is a historical link, based on a common principle and identical provisions, between the system of privileges and immunities granted to the Members of the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe and that granted to the Members of the Parliament', and that such link 'justifies harmonising the two texts for the purpose of interpreting the scope of parliamentary immunity in the present case' and the Olteanu report of the Committee on Rules of Procedure and Immunities of the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe provides that 'the immunities also apply when new Assembly members travel to the Assembly part-session during which their credentials will be ratified'.
6. Article 9(2) of Protocol No 7, which protects free movement of Members travelling to or from the place of meeting of the European Parliament, have to be interpreted in a way which includes free movement of elected Members travelling to the place of meeting of the European Parliament for its constitutive session; if elected Members do not have this right guaranteed, the functional dimension of immunity would be pre-empted as it would not protect the institution from external interferences where unnecessary or non-proportionate requirements are imposed to elected Members in order to prevent them to acquire the condition of Member of the European Parliament and would leave the door open to Member States to modify the list of elected Members at their will; therefore it can be established that immunity applies from the moment when the candidate is proclaimed an elected Member.
7. Immunity is a prerogative of consolidated tradition, which evolved from an approach based on privileges to a guarantee to protect the separation of powers and, in particular, the statute of political representatives; the separation of powers cannot be conceived as a threat to the judiciary but as a system of checks and balances that is an essential dimension of the democratic principles in which the Spanish constitutional system is based on, as well as the European Union as enshrined in Article 2 TEU; additionally, according to the CJEU judgment on the *Gollnisch* case, immunity protects institutions and, by extension, their representatives; therefore, to protect the immunity of the legislative power is to protect the democratic principles.
8. EU jurisprudence stresses the functional dimension of immunity which is aimed at protecting the functioning and independence of EU institutions. In fact, the CJEU judgment on the *Mote* case stresses that 'as regards the Protocol, in particular, the privileges and immunities which it grants to the European Communities have a purely functional character, inasmuch as they are intended to avoid any interference with the functioning and independence of the Communities (orders in *Case 1/88 SA Générale de Banque v Commission* [1989] ECR 857, paragraph 9, and in *Case C-2/88 IMM Zwartfeld and Others* [1990] ECR I-3365, paragraph 19)'. EU case law emphasises this aspect, in addition to the fact that immunities can also be considered a subjective right of the Members. Rule 5(2) of the Rules of Procedure also stresses the functional dimension of immunity when it lays down that 'in exercising its powers on privileges and immunities, Parliament shall act to uphold its integrity as a democratic legislative assembly and to

ensure the independence of its Members in the performance of their duties. Parliamentary immunity is not a Member's personal privilege but a guarantee of the independence of Parliament as a whole, and of its Members'.

9. The continuation of criminal proceedings against Carles Puigdemont i Casamajó, Oriol Junqueras i Vies and Antoni Comín i Oliveres in Spain without a prior request to the European Parliament for their immunity to be waived and the Orders of the Criminal Chamber of the Spanish Supreme Court of 14 and 15 June 2019 amount to a serious breach of Carles Puigdemont i Casamajó, Oriol Junqueras i Vies and Antoni Comín i Oliveres' privileges and immunities as elected Members of the European Parliament and are explicitly aimed at preventing them from taking their seats in the Parliament as representatives of the citizens of the Union.
10. Immunity would become meaningless if a Member State could imprison or refuse to release elected Members to prevent them from completing any steps deemed necessary to acquire their status of Members of the European Parliament or to stop them from travelling to the place of meeting of the European Parliament to take their seats.
11. The European parliamentary immunity is established by EU law, with its own prerogatives other than those established by national law, and which national law needs to comply with due to the primacy of EU law; conditioning immunity to certain administrative procedures established by national law would produce an unjustified distortion of the system of guarantees established by EU law.
12. According to the joint analysis of Articles 6 and 8 of the 1976 Electoral Act and Protocol No 7, Member States are not allowed to regulate any additional requirements after the proclamation of elected members that would prevent immunity to take effect as, on the one hand, Article 8 of the Electoral Act establishes that Member States can only regulate issues linked to the electoral procedure in compliance with the Electoral Act and, on the other, Article 6 of the Electoral Act establishes that immunity is governed by Protocol No 7 which, as argued above, applies from the moment where the candidate has been proclaimed elected.
13. The decisions of the Spanish Electoral Commission, first refusing to communicate to the European Parliament that Carles Puigdemont i Casamajó, Oriol Junqueras i Vies and Antoni Comín i Oliveres have been elected as Members, and secondly, declaring their seats as 'vacant' and purporting that they 'have not acquired the status of Members of the European Parliament' because they did not appear in person to pledge allegiance to the Spanish Constitution,<sup>10</sup> infringe both Spanish and EU law, and are the intended consequence of the violation of their immunity.
14. The CJEU judgment on the *Donnici* case states that Member States 'have the task of organising the elections, in accordance with the procedure laid down by their national provisions, and also, in that connection, of counting the votes and making the official declaration of the electoral results (order in Case T-215/07 *Donnici v Parliament*, paragraph 74)'. The same approach can be found in several occasions in EU case law; therefore, the Court establishes the scope of the Member States' prerogative to regulate

---

<sup>10</sup> Decisions of 17 and 20 June 2019. Mr. Puigdemont, Mr. Junqueras and Mr. Comín did actually pledge allegiance to the Spanish Constitution through a notarized document in June and September 2019, respectively.

the electoral procedure, which includes only the three aspects enumerated. Once the electoral results have been proclaimed, Member States cannot establish further requirements that alter the list of the elected members after the official declaration of the electoral results has been made.

15. In addition, Article 12 of the 1976 Electoral Act establishes the obligation of the European Parliament to take note of the results declared officially by the Member States for the purpose of verifying the credentials of the members of the European Parliament and rule on any disputes which may arise out of the provisions of the 1976 Electoral Act other than those arising out of the national provisions to which the 1976 Electoral Act refers; in this regard, it is important to note that the publication of the decision on the proclamation of the names of elected Members of the European Parliament, as required by Article 224(1) of the Spanish Electoral Law took place on 14 June 2019; therefore, Spain should notify the names included in this decision and the European Parliament should take note of it as established in Article 12 of the Electoral Act in order for Oriol Junqueras i Vies, Carles Puigdemont i Casamajó and Antoni Comín i Oliveres to finalise the administrative requirements to take his seat in the European Parliament with effect from the opening of the first sitting following the elections.
16. In its Order of 14 June 2019, the Spanish Supreme Court argued that Oriol Junqueras i Vies' political rights should be temporarily suspended until the judgment is issued. However, the need for immunity, as a guarantee of the democratic State, to deploy its effects could only be 'temporarily suspended' if the principles and rules of EU law are ignored. This situation pre-empts the right to political participation and representation which is a fundamental right enshrined in Article 23 of the Spanish Constitution, Article 39 of the Charter and Article 3 of Protocol No 1 of the ECHR, and is an interpretation of national law incompatible with EU law, including Protocol No 7.
17. As argued above, the reference to national law should be understood to include only the material aspects and the guarantees of immunity and therefore only a parliamentary authorization can trigger the waiver of immunity; additional restrictions introduced by national authorities are in breach of EU law and Protocol No 7.
18. In addition, regarding the impact on the right to stand as a candidate, the CJEU judgment on the *Delvigne* case stresses that any limitation on the exercise of the rights laid down in Article 39(2) of the Charter must be provided for by law, respect the essence of those rights and freedoms, be subject to the principle of proportionality and be made only if they are necessary and genuinely meet objectives of general interest recognised by the Union or the need to protect the rights and freedoms of others; however, there are no provisions under Spanish law or EU law that allow for the restrictions imposed by the Spanish Supreme Court.
19. Indeed, the immunity conferred pursuant to Article 9(2) of Protocol No 7 to travel to the place of meeting of the European Parliament should be interpreted as specifically protecting against any judicial restrictions imposed on free movement which prevents elected Members of the European Parliament from completing all procedural requirements necessary to take up their seats in Parliament, including the declarations foreseen in Rule 3(2) of the Rules of Procedure;

20. Therefore, the continued imprisonment by the Spanish Supreme Court of elected Member of Parliament Oriol Junqueras i Vies, and the Court's refusal to grant him prison leave to take his seat and travel to the place of meeting of the European Parliament, violate his privileges and immunities under paragraphs 1 and 2 of Article 9 of Protocol (No 7) on the Privileges and Immunities of the European Union. Similarly, the existing national arrest warrants issued by the investigative judge of the Spanish Supreme Court against elected Members of the European Parliament Carles Puigdemont i Casamajó and Antoni Comín i Oliveres, and the decision not to withdraw them, violate their privileges and immunities under paragraphs 1 and 2 of Article 9 of Protocol No 7 on the Privileges and Immunities of the European Union;
21. According to Rule of Procedure 9(8) it is only within the powers of the committee and not within the power of the President of the European Parliament to decide on the admissibility of this request.

**Therefore we respectfully request the European Parliament to take the necessary measures, pursuant to Rule 9 of the Rules of Procedure, following the required hearings and the proposal of the Committee on Legal Affairs, to assert the privileges and immunities of the said elected Members of the European Parliament, and in particular:**

- a) Defend the privileges and immunities of elected Members of the European Parliament Carles Puigdemont i Casamajó, Oriol Junqueras i Vies, and Antoni Comín i Oliveres;
- b) Declare that the criminal proceedings and the restrictions on the freedom of movement of Carles Puigdemont i Casamajó, Oriol Junqueras i Vies, and Antoni Comín i Oliveres infringe their privileges and immunities under paragraphs 1 and 2 of Article 9 of Protocol (No 7) on the Privileges and Immunities of the European Union,
- c) Declare that only by means of a request by the Spanish authorities, as laid down in Rule 6 of the Rules of Procedure, immunity can be waived;
- d) Forward this decision immediately to the competent authorities of Spain.

#### List of co-signing MEPs

1. François Alfonsi (Greens/EFA)
2. Petra de Sutter (Greens/EFA)
3. Clare Daly (GUE/NGL)
4. Mick Wallace (GUE/NGL)
5. Luke Ming Flanagan (GUE/NGL)
6. Stasys Jakeliunas (Greens/EFA)
7. Anne Sophie Pelletier (GUE/NGL)
8. Leila Chaibi (GUE/NGL)
9. Benoit Biteau (Greens/EFA)
10. Kateřina Konečná (GUE/NGL)
11. Tatjana Zdanoka (Greens/EFA)
12. Johan Van Overtveldt (ECR)
13. Nikolaj Villumsen (GUE/NGL)
14. Margrethe Auken (Greens/EFA)
15. Alyn Smith (Greens/EFA)

16. Geert Bourgeois (ECR)
17. Milan Brglez (SD)
18. Monika Vana (Greens/EFA)
19. Marisa Matias (GUE/NGL)
20. Marketa Gregorova (Greens/EFA)
21. Nico Semsrott (Greens/EFA)
22. Jill Evans (Greens/EFA)
23. Martin Sonneborn (NI)
24. Assita Kanko (ECR)
25. Christian Allard (Greens/EFA)
26. Ozlem Demirel (GUE/NGL)
27. Manon Aubry (GUE/NGL)
28. Mislav Kolakuši (NI)
29. Damien Carême (Greens/EFA)
30. Manuel Bompard (GUE/NGL)
31. Matt Carthy (GUE/NGL)
32. Martina Anderson (GUE/NGL)
33. Fernando Barrena (GUE/NGL)
34. Francisco Guerreiro (Greens/EFA)
35. José Gusmao (GUE/NGL)
36. Aileen McLeod (Greens/EFA)
37. Izaskun Bilbao (Renew Europe)
38. Diana Riba i Giner (Greens/EFA) on behalf of Carles Puigdemont, Oriol Junqueras and Antoni Comín