

Personalised Risk Assessment – Return to Croatia

(For Dublin Transfer Review)

1. Basic Facts (Undisputed Timeline)

- Nationality: Chinese
- First entry into EU: via Croatia
- Date of entry: 15 October 2024
- Asylum application in Croatia: registered upon entry
- Subsequent asylum application: Norway, 05 November 2025
- Dublin request accepted by Croatia: 03 December 2025

These facts are confirmed by Eurodac and are not disputed.

2. Incident of Violence by Croatian Police (Individualised Event)

- Location: Croatian border area (exact location can be provided if required)
- Actors: Two Croatian police officers
- Event description:
 - Upon expressing the intention to seek asylum, I was physically assaulted
 - I was kicked by officers
 - No explanation, documentation, or legal procedure was provided
- Aftermath:
 - No access to complaint mechanism
 - No medical or legal assistance offered
 - Immediate fear of further retaliation

This incident occurred after I explicitly expressed intent to seek asylum.

3. Nature of Risk: Why This Is Not a “General Condition” Claim

This risk is not abstract and not systemic-only.

It is personalised and event-based.

Key distinction:

- Not: “Croatia is generally unsafe”
- But: “I have already been identified, assaulted, and intimidated by state actors”

This creates:

- Fear of repeat targeting
 - Fear of retaliation
 - Fear of procedural neglect during asylum processing
-

4. Secondary Risk: Procedural & Non-Refoulement Exposure

Specific risks upon return:

- Lack of trust in police and authorities due to prior violence
- Psychological deterrence from seeking protection again
- Increased vulnerability to summary processing or neglect
- Risk of indirect refoulement due to:
- Fast-track processing
- Lack of effective complaint access
- Fear-induced non-engagement

This raises a real risk under:

- ECHR Article 3
 - Non-refoulement principle (1951 Convention, Art. 33)
-

5. Personal Profile Increasing Vulnerability

- I am not a typical economic migrant
- I have produced written analyses and critical materials on:
- Chinese society
- Authoritarian structures
- Civilizational systems
- My fear is not only removal, but misclassification and silence

I do not claim Croatia is hostile in principle, but that:

Croatia lacks the institutional capacity and environment to safely process a highly individualised, politically sensitive claim like mine.

6. Core Legal Argument (Concise)

The UDI decision relies on a presumption of safety.

However:

A prior act of violence by state agents, combined with fear of re-exposure and procedural deterrence, rebuts the presumption that return would be safe for this individual.

This case therefore merits:

- Suspension of transfer
 - Or discretionary examination under §32(2)
 - Or enhanced scrutiny under §73
-

7. What Is Requested (Minimal & Reasonable)

- Recognition that this case involves individualised risk, not general conditions
 - Temporary suspension of transfer pending deeper assessment
 - Consideration of Norway as the appropriate forum for a full merits examination
-

One-sentence summary for the lawyer / judge:

“ This is not a claim about Croatia in general, but about a documented personal encounter with violence by state actors that creates a real, individualised risk of harm and procedural denial upon return.”