# Abstract

While deportation has given rise to a rich scholarship in social sciences, there has been significantly less legal research on the instruments regulating how states can require foreigners to leave their territory and how these laws impact compulsory mobility of non-citizens in and from Europe. This thesis lays the foundations for a research agenda on the European legal regime of deportation and its concrete translation in national contexts, using the French administrative judiciary as a casestudy.

Among European states, France can be characterized as an extreme case, issuing a third of the deportation orders at the European level every year. Almost a third of these deportation orders are appealed before administrative tribunals. This places French administrative judges at a critical junction: they have become a central cog in the state's deportation machinery, daily interpreting and applying the complex set of rules derived from the legal frameworks which make up the European deportation regime. The critical position of administrative judges in the deportation regime serves as a starting point to understand whether and how the everyday adjudication of deportation cases shapes the deportability of foreign nationals in Europe.

The thesis provides novel insights into how the European deportation regime is shaped through national judicial practice. It shows that the procedures and techniques of judicial control over deportation orders in France are, to a significant extent, the result of deliberate choices made by the Council of State, in which European human rights and the litigative pressure of deportation on lower courts both play important parts. By leveraging the standardized nature of French judicial decisions, the thesis makes concrete methodological contributions to studying the legal reasoning of courts on a large scale. Applying this approach to mass litigation in French lower courts, this thesis develops empirically-grounded understandings of legal reasoning in deportation adjudication.