

**ANALYSIS OF DOMESTIC LEGAL FRAMEWORK
AND PRACTICE ON THE RESTRICTION OF LEGAL CAPACITY
OF PERSONS WITH MENTAL HEALTH ISSUES:
Execution of the European Court of Human Rights
judgement *Nikolyan vs Armenia***



Prepared by Sergey Ghazinyan
Council of Europe Consultant

June 2024

COUNCIL OF EUROPE



CONSEIL DE L'EUROPE

**ANALYSIS OF DOMESTIC LEGAL FRAMEWORK
AND PRACTICE ON THE RESTRICTION
OF LEGAL CAPACITY OF PERSONS
WITH MENTAL HEALTH ISSUES:
Execution of the European Court of Human Rights
judgement *Nikolyan vs Armenia***

**Prepared by Sergey Ghazinyan
Council of Europe Consultant**

as part of the Council of Europe project
“Protection of Human Rights in Biomedicine II”
implemented in the framework of the Council of Europe
Action Plan for Armenia 2023-2026

June 2024

Council of Europe

***Analysis of domestic legal framework and
practice on the restriction of legal capacity of
persons with mental health issues:
execution of the European Court of Human Rights
judgement Nikolyan vs Armenia***

The opinions expressed in this work are the responsibility of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official policy of the Council of Europe.

The reproduction of extracts (up to 500 words) is authorised, except for commercial purposes, as long as the integrity of the text is preserved, the excerpt is not used out of context, does not provide incomplete information or does not otherwise mislead the reader as to the nature, scope or content of the text.

The source text must always be acknowledged as follows
“© Council of Europe, year of the publication”.
All requests concerning the reproduction or translation of all or part of this document should be addressed to the Directorate of Communication (F-67075 Strasbourg Cedex)
All other correspondence concerning this document should be addressed to the Directorate General of Human Rights and Rule of Law. Email: DGI-CDBIO@coe.int

Cover photo: Shutterstock

This publication has not been copy-edited by the SPDP Editorial Unit to correct typographical and grammatical errors

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF ACRONYMS	4
INTRODUCTION	5
BACKGROUND AND THE SCOPE OF ANALYSIS	7
ESTABLISHMENT OF TAILOR-MADE RESTRICTIONS OF LEGAL CAPACITY	12
ASSESSMENT OF LEGAL CAPACITY AND “SUFFICIENTLY RECENT”	
EXPERT OPINION	21
REVIEW OF RESTRICTION OF LEGAL CAPACITY	25
GUARDIANSHIP AND TRUSTEESHIP SYSTEM	31

List of acronyms

CC – Civil Code

CPC – Civil Procedure Code

MLSA – Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs

Introduction

Legal capacity is a cornerstone in jurisprudence, delineating an individual's ability to exercise rights, make decisions, and partake in legal proceedings autonomously. However, this fundamental principle encounters challenges when it comes to persons with mental health issues. The balance between safeguarding autonomy and ensuring protection for individuals with mental health problems necessitates a thorough examination of legal frameworks, precedents, and ethical considerations.

The European Court of Human Rights (the Court) examined different aspects of this issue under Article 8 on the Right to respect for private and family life, home and correspondence of the European Convention on Human Rights (the Convention). Amongst other cases, *Nikolyan vs Armenia* has a unique role. It not only revealed the issues of a general nature in the Republic of Armenia, but also further developed the Court case law about the human rights protection of persons with mental health issues.¹

The current legal analysis aims to examine the legal framework and practice of the Republic of Armenia regarding the restriction of legal capacities of persons with mental health problems within the execution of the Court judgement *Nikolyan vs Armenia*. In this frame, the report touches upon 4 main aspects: establishment of different levels of restricting the legal capacity, "recent" and detailed examination reports of experts, review of legal capacity and effectiveness of the guardianship system.

Notably, recommendations provided in the current report can be divided into three main types: legislative and institutional amendments directly relevant to the execution of the *Nikolyan vs Armenia* judgement, proposals for practical steps to implement those amendments, and suggestions for further improvement of the field. At the end of each section, along with the recommendations, notes are made about their relevance to the execution of the *Nikolyan vs Armenia* judgement.

In the context of the development of the document, the legal regulations related to administrative proceedings and civil proceedings, as well as other legal acts related to advocacy, were also analysed. The research also addresses practical challenges. The scope of studies includes

¹ *Nikolyan vs Armenia* (Application No. 74438/14, judgment 3 October 2019), available at: <https://hudoc.echr.coe.int/eng?i=001-196149>.

not only the case law of the Court and the domestic legal framework but also the precedent decisions of the Court of Cassation of the Republic of Armenia, the Constitutional Court of the Republic of Armenia, as well as the reports of the Human Rights Defender of the Republic of Armenia.

While developing the current report, the results of expert discussions on the “Issues regarding the functional capacity of persons with mental health problems in the context of the case law of the European Court of Human Rights” and on “The rights of persons being declared as legally incapable as a result of mental health issues” organised as part of the Council of Europe project “Protection of Human Rights in Biomedicine” on 9-10 December 2022 and on 5 February 2024 respectively, are considered.

The report on the *“Access to justice for legally incapable persons and non-execution/late execution of decisions of national courts”* prepared as part of the project “Armenia: Support for the execution by Armenia of judgment in respect of Article 6 of the European Convention on Human Rights” was served as a ground for further analysis.

The report provides legislative amendments and practice improvement recommendations after the legal analysis. The consultant would like to express gratitude to all the stakeholders engaged in the assessment for their effective cooperation.

Background and the scope of analysis

Before turning to the analysis, it is important to present the key facts of *Nikolyan vs Armenia*. In April 2012, the applicant started legal actions to divorce his wife and remove her from his apartment. In return, his wife and their son took legal action to declare him legally incapable. Later in the same year, a panel of psychiatric experts concluded that the applicant suffered from a delusional disorder, which deprived him of his ability to understand and control his actions. In November 2013, the Shengavit District Court of General Jurisdiction in Yerevan (District Court) declared Mr Nikolyan legally incapable. This decision was further confirmed by the Court of Appeal of the Republic of Armenia.

According to the domestic legal regulations at the given period, the person deprived of legal capacity could access the court exclusively through his guardian. In this context, the guardianship needed to be conflict-free. However, following the declaration of the applicant as legally incapable, the local body of guardianship and trusteeship appointed his son as the legal guardian, despite their conflictual relationship and the applicant's opposition. Hence, the guardianship and trusteeship body had failed to hear the applicant despite the legal requirement to consider his wishes, if possible.

However, in the given case, the conflict-free and neutral guardianship by the son of the applicant was doubtful, specifically in the frame of the claim the applicant filed against his wife, seeking to divorce and evict her. Following the request of his son as the legal guardian, the divorce and eviction cases were terminated. The Court ruled that the District Court had failed to examine whether the request by the son of the applicant to withdraw the claim had been in the applicant's best interests or to provide any explanation for its decision to accept that request. The domestic court did not scrutinise and oversee when accepting the request to withdraw the applicant's claim. Consequently, the termination of those proceedings had been unjustified.

The right to ask a court to review a declaration of incapacity was one of the fundamental procedural rights for protecting those who had been partially or fully deprived of legal capacity. The general prohibition in the Republic of Armenia at the material time on direct access to a court by persons declared incapable did not leave any room for exception. According to the Court, the applicant's inability to seek restoration of his legal capacity directly at the material time was disproportionate to any legitimate aim pursued.

According to the Court, the deprivation of the applicant's legal capacity amounted to an interference with his right to private life under Article 8 of the Convention. The District Court

of the Republic of Armenia decision declaring the applicant incapable had relied solely on the psychiatric expert opinion. The existence of a mental disorder, even a serious one, could not be the sole reason to justify full deprivation of legal capacity. By analogy with the cases concerning deprivation of liberty, in order to justify full deprivation of legal capacity, the mental disorder had to be “of a kind or degree” to justify such a measure.

The Court also ruled that the psychiatric expert report had not analysed the degree of the applicant’s incapacity in sufficient detail. The report did not explain what kind of actions the applicant could not understand or control. Furthermore, although the applicant’s condition required some measure of protection in his respect, the domestic court had no choice but to apply and maintain full incapacity. In particular, the law of the Republic of Armenia did not provide for any borderline or tailor-made response in situations such as that of the applicant. It distinguished only between full capacity and full incapacity. This most stringent measure meant total loss of autonomy in nearly all areas of life.

The objectivity of medical evidence entailed a requirement that it be sufficiently recent. The question of whether the evidence was sufficiently recent depended on the peculiarities of the case. The psychiatric expert opinion had been issued in September 2012, more than fourteen months before the judgment, declaring the applicant incapable and almost a year and a half before the decision of the Civil Court of Appeal of the Republic of Armenia upholding that judgment. Thus, the Court considered that the opinion could not be regarded as “up to date”. Moreover, it had been the first time that the applicant had been subjected to a psychiatric medical examination, as he had had no history of mental illness, and nothing suggested that the applicant’s condition was irreversible.

The District Court had relied solely on that opinion without questioning whether it credibly reflected the applicant’s state of mental health at the material time. As for the Civil Court of Appeal, it had referred to the absence of any evidence rebutting the findings of that report or suggesting that the applicant had recovered, despite the fact that it was the duty of the domestic courts to seek such evidence and, if necessary, to assign a new medical examination. The measure imposed on the applicant was disproportionate to the legitimate aim pursued. As a result, the applicant’s rights under Article 8 were restricted more than was strictly necessary. Thus, the Court unanimously found a violation of Articles 6 §1 and 8 of the Convention.

According to the Action Report of *Nikolyan vs Armenia* (Action Report), the Government of the Republic of Armenia identified three general measures. The first one concerns the legislative blanket ban on direct access to the courts for those declared incapable, which did not leave any room for exception. Under this frame, the Government of the Republic of Armenia underlined the adoption of the new CPC of the Republic of Armenia. It prescribes the right of those declared as

legally incapable to seek restoration of legal capacity in court. The provisions of the CPC of the Republic of Armenia introduce several procedural guarantees, which can be listed as follows:

- the court of first instance examines the application on declaring a person as legally incapable with the mandatory participation of this person, his/her lawyer and the guardianship authority and hears the arguments from all the participants;
- depending on the state of health of the person being declared as legally incapable, the court can examine the claim at the place of his/her record registration or at his/her residence or at the psychiatric institution in which the concerned person is placed;
- upon accepting the application on declaring a person as legally incapable of proceedings, the court shall grant free legal aid to the person (a person being declared as legally incapable may refuse the services of a public defender and have an advocate of his/her own choice);
- a person being declared as legally incapable has all the procedural rights, such as familiarise himself/herself with the materials of the case, submitting evidence and participating in its examination, filing motions, testifying before the court, presenting his/her arguments and position concerning all the issues arising during the court session, express his/her position with regard to motions and arguments of other persons participating in the case, appeal against judicial acts, etc.;
- the person declared as legally incapable may at any time apply to the court to restore his/her legal capacity.²

The mentioned developments allow to conclude that the procedural safeguards (for example, free legal aid, mandatory participation of the person in question, his/her lawyer and the guardianship authority, clear procedural status during court proceedings for the person declared legally incapable and the rights of persons participating in the case) for people whose legal capacity was being discussed were significantly strengthened. Moreover, the removal of the blanket ban on depriving legally incapable persons of access to court for seeking restoration of legal capacity should be welcomed. Furthermore, the issues related to the access to court ruled by the Court in *Nikolyan vs Armenia* case and the decision of the Constitutional Court of the Republic of Armenia N SDO 1197 were solved through the above-mentioned amendments in the CPC of the Republic of Armenia, the current report will avoid discussing this issue in detail and concentrate more on the remaining observations, seeking general intervention.

The next general measure the Government of the Republic of Armenia identifies is to ensure conflict-free guardianship. Under this, it is envisaged that the guardianship and trusteeship bodies,

² Action Report (16 November 2020) of the *Nikolyan vs Armenia* (Application No. 74438/14, judgment 3 October 2019), available at: [https://hudoc.exec.coe.int/ENG?i=DH-DD\(2020\)1061E](https://hudoc.exec.coe.int/ENG?i=DH-DD(2020)1061E).

by participating in the court hearings on declaring a person legally incapable, will better understand the nature of the relationship between the person being declared as legally incapable and his/her relatives as potential guardians. As a result, it would be able to ensure conflict-free guardianship. While acknowledging the importance of the guardianship authority in participating in the court hearings not only from the perspective of gaining information but also serving as an important source of information for the court, in this aspect, further analysis and steps are required. It should aim to strengthen the capacity of the guardianship and trusteeship bodies to ensure conflict-free guardianship for persons declared legally incapable.³

The last general measure is about legal initiatives and policy papers to enhance the protection of the rights of persons with disabilities. “The Law on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities” of the Republic of Armenia has been adopted, which defines the main principles of the state policy on ensuring, promoting and protecting the rights of persons with disabilities. However, this legislation is restricted to persons with disabilities, which does not necessarily include persons with mental health issues.

The Government of the Republic of Armenia also highlighted the Strategic Programme of Legal and Judicial Reforms in the Republic of Armenia for 2019-2023 and the List of Measures Deriving from the Programme, the Action Plan deriving from the National Strategy on Human Rights Protection for 2020-2022 and the Programme of the Government of the Republic of Armenia for 2019-2022, that include an extensive list of measures to be implemented to ensure compliance of the national legislation with international standards.⁴

One of the noteworthy activities is in the Action Plan of the National Strategy on Human Rights Protection 2020-2022, which envisages ensuring the involvement of persons with disabilities including persons with mental issues in decision-making that affects them. This included analysis of the field and submission of amendments to the CC of the Republic of Armenia to the National Assembly.⁵ Furthermore, referring to this activity, the MLSA drafted and circulated a draft decree of the Government of the Republic of Armenia to review the legal capacity system and establish a mechanism of support in decision-making.⁶ However, according to the report, the decree was not adopted, and the draft was returned to the MLSA.⁷

³ Ibid.

⁴ Ibid.

⁵ Action Plan deriving from the National Strategy on Human Rights Protection for 2020-2022 approved by the Decree N 1978-L of the Government of the Republic of Armenia, dated on December 26, 2019, Annex N 2, Activity 47, available at: <https://www.arlis.am/DocumentView.aspx?DocID=138194>.

⁶ Draft decree of the Government of the Republic of Armenia on approving the program on reviewing the legal regulations on the institute of legal capacity and establishment of the mechanism for support in decision-making, available at: <https://www.e-draft.am/projects/4923>.

⁷ 2022 Report on Action Plan deriving from the National Strategy on Human Rights Protection for 2020-2022, published by the Ministry of Justice, available at: <https://moj.am/storage/uploads/%D5%84%D4%BB%D5%8A%202020-2022%D5%A9%D5%A9.%20%D4%B3%D4%BE%202022%D5%A9.%20%D5%BF%D5%A1%D6%80%D5%A5%D5%AF%D5%A1%D5%B6%20%D5%B0%D5%A1%D5%B7%D5%BE%D5%A5%D5%BF%D5%BE%D5%B8%D6%82%D5%A9%D5%B5>

Furthermore, the pending Action Plan of the National Strategy on Human Rights Protection 2023-2025 envisages the review of the legal regulations on the right to access the court of persons declared legally incapable, excluding unproportionate restrictions of their rights to apply to court and heard on the other issues related to their rights and interests.⁸

From the above-discussed main observation of the Court findings and the state of execution, several other aspects that need general intervention were identified. The most problematic issue is the absence of borderline or tailor-made responses in situations such as that of the applicant. In this sense, this study aims to analyse the Council of Europe standards, including the Court case law and the experience of other member states, to provide recommendations on establishing different levels of restricting the legal capacity.

Another issue identified in the *Nikolyan vs Armenia* judgement is that the opinion was not “up to date”. Moreover, the court’s obligation to scrutinise other evidence is also important. The third issue relates to conflict-free guardianship. In this frame, the current report analyses the legislative regulations on the role and mandate of the guardianship and trusteeship bodies and provides recommendations on legislative amendments to ensure proper supervision over the guardianship of persons declared legally incapable.

The last issue that is analysed in the report relates to the review of legal capacity. According to the current regulations, the legal capacity can be restored by applying the legally incapable person himself/herself or his/her guardian. The possibility and models of periodic automatic review of the restoration of legal capacity are discussed in the current report.

D5%B8%D6%82%D5%B6%20(2).pdf.

⁸ Action Plan deriving from the National Strategy on Human Rights Protection for 2023-2025 approved by the Decree N 1674-L of the Government of the Republic of Armenia, dated on September 28, 2023, Annex N 3, Activity 3.12, available at: <https://moj.am/storage/uploads/1674.1.pdf>.

permitted only in strict accordance with the Convention and cannot be based solely on the fact that a person has mental health issues.¹⁴

The legitimate aim of restricting the legal capacity entails its prescription in the law and the insurance of the proportionality principle. This is possible only if the legislation gives the possibility to ensure individual and tailor-made approaches to any case. Therefore, as the Court also ruled in *Nikolyan vs Armenia*, the restriction of legal capacity should be on a necessary scale. Hence, the legislation should not prescribe two extreme possibilities: full legal capacity or full deprivation of legal capacity, but more flexible options for the courts on restricting the legal capacity.¹⁵

The Recommendation No. R(99)4 of the Ministers “*On the principles concerning the legal protection of incapable adults*”, dated February 23, 1999, prescribes that the intervention should be of the minimum necessary volume. In particular, it states that if a measure of protection is necessary, it should be proportional to the degree of capacity of the person concerned and tailored to the individual circumstances and needs of the person concerned. The measure of protection should interfere with the legal capacity, rights and freedoms of the person concerned to the minimum extent consistent with achieving the purpose of the intervention. Hence, the legislation should provide different restriction levels, which may change over time. Accordingly, a measure of protection should not automatically result in completely removing legal capacity.

However, a restriction of legal capacity should be possible where it is shown to be necessary to protect the person concerned. In particular, a measure of protection should not automatically deprive the person concerned of the right to vote, to make a will, or to consent or refuse consent to any intervention in the health field, or to make other decisions of a personal character at any time when his or her capacity permits him or her to do so. Consideration should be given to legal arrangements whereby, even when representation in a particular area is necessary, the adult may be permitted to undertake specific acts or acts in a specific area with the representative’s consent. Whenever possible, the adult should be able to enter into legally effective transactions of an everyday nature.¹⁶

Despite the importance of the principles of equality before the law and the proportional and necessary limitation of rights also enshrined in the Constitution, domestic legislation does not allow limiting or restricting a person’s legal capacity other than full incapacity. It does not provide for different levels of legal capacity of persons with mental health problems, thus limiting the possibility for an individual approach. Due to this legislative issue, the courts do not have many

¹⁴ Decision No SD1197 of the Constitutional Court dated 7 April 2015, available at: <https://www.arlis.am/DocumentView.aspx?docID=96759>:

¹⁵ *Supra note 1*

¹⁶ Recommendation No. R(99)4 “*On the principles concerning the legal protection of incapable adults*”, dated February 23, 1999, of the Council of Europe Committee of Ministers, available at: [https://www.coe.int/t/dg3/healthbioethic/texts_and_documents/Rec\(99\)4E.pdf](https://www.coe.int/t/dg3/healthbioethic/texts_and_documents/Rec(99)4E.pdf).

options but either decline the application of declaring the person as legally incapable or decide on full deprivation of legal capacity. The existence of a tailor-made system would make it possible to adjust the extent of limiting the legal capacity to the person's mental capacity, ensuring the principle of proportionality. According to the current regulations, if the person is declared legally incapable, the only remaining right is access to court to restore the legal capacity.

In this frame, it is important to discuss the decision of the Court of Cassation of the Republic of Armenia No SD/1224/02/01 on setting criteria for the deprivation of legal capacity, finding the need for the development of legal practice and ensuring unified and foreseeable practice. In particular, it interprets the term "mental disorder" used in the CC of the Republic of Armenia, also referring to the judgement *Nikolyan vs Armenia* and defining the "legal incapacity". According to the court, legal incapacity is the lack of ability of a citizen to acquire and exercise civil rights through his/her actions, create civil duties for himself, and fulfil them. It adds that the necessary condition for recognising a citizen as incapacitated is to record the fact of not understanding the meaning of his actions or being unable to control them due to a mental disorder. The court highlights that the assessment of the proportionality of deprivation of legal capacity should be based on criteria such as the severity of the behaviour disorder and whether it requires care and treatment.

Summarising the above, the Court of Cassation of the Republic of Armenia notes that the citizen's inability to understand the meaning of his actions or his inability to control them is a sufficient condition for considering a certain "kind of a degree" of behavioural disorder as a consequence of mental health issues, which can also occur without a mental disorder. It is necessary to show certain functions and behavioural disorders in such a way that it will be possible to unconditionally identify which actions the citizen cannot understand or control, to form a clear picture of the degree of the citizen's illness, the possible consequences of his illness on his social life, health, material interests, etc., as a result, also about the proportionality of the application of the measure of recognising the citizen as legally incapable.

Furthermore, the Court of Cassation of the Republic of Armenia also provided some guiding principles for the lower instance courts on assessment of the evidence in cases on deprivation of legal capacity. The main principle flagged by the court is that the deprivation of legal capacity is important and should be applicable, as well as that mental disorder also covers behavioural disorders. In the concluding part of the decision, the court sent it back for re-examination and ordered to address more specific questions to be asked to the forensic psychiatric experts.¹⁷

¹⁷ Decision No SD/1224/02/01 of the Court of Cassation dated on 6 April 2023, available at: <https://www.cassationcourt.am/precedent/precedent-single-decision/civil-cases/2020>.

The analysis of the domestic legislation and experience of other Council of Europe member states revealed several models. One of them is to elaborate on the system of limited legal capacity enshrined in the CC and include persons with mental health issues. This mechanism comes from the so-called “Soviet period” and exists in Armenia as well. It refers to a person who has put his family in a difficult financial situation as a result of alcohol or drug abuse, as well as being attracted to gambling. This is the reason why it existed in the post-Soviet countries, as discussed below.

In Armenia, the court may limit the legal capacity under the procedure established by the CPC of the Republic of Armenia and establish a trusteeship for the person. The person whose legal capacity is restricted can conclude other transactions, as well as receive salary, pension and other incomes and manage them only with the consent of the trustee. If the grounds on which the person’s legal capacity was limited have disappeared, the court removes the limitation of his legal capacity. Based on the court’s decision, the trusteeship established for him/her is abolished.

The main purpose of such restriction is to limit the autonomy of a person concerning the decisions on his/her property, thus leaving the right to conclude only minor household transactions independently. It is not relevant to persons with mental health issues. The aim and scope of restrictions in the case of a person with mental health issues and those who have put their family in a difficult financial situation as a result of alcohol or drug abuse, as well as being attracted to gambling, are significantly different.

In discussing the reforms of this mechanism in other states, particular attention should be paid to the Court case *Shtukatorov vs Russia*, part of the *Rakevich vs Russia* group of cases. The domestic regulations of Russia during the given period were very similar to those of Armenia: the domestic courts should either recognise the person as completely incapable or reject the application to recognise the person as incapable without the possibility of making a proportional decision. The CC of the Russian Federation has provided for a third, intermediate status of legal capacity to execute these judgements, among other implemented general measures.¹⁸ Notably, the Ministers considered the implemented general measures, including the reforms in the CC, sufficient and found the *Rakevich vs Russia* group of cases, including the *Shtukatorov vs Russia* case, executed and closed.¹⁹

A similar solution, extending the institute of limited legal capacity to cover persons with mental health issues, is made in Ukraine. In particular, according to the CC, the court may limit the legal capacity of an individual if he/she suffers from a mental health issue that significantly affects his/her ability to understand the meaning of his/her actions and (or) manage them. The Ukrainian

¹⁸ Action Report (18 November 2020) of the *Rakevich* and 8 other cases vs Russian Federation (Application No. 58973/00), available at: <https://rm.coe.int/0900001680a075df>:

¹⁹ CM/ResDH(2020)333 on the Execution of the judgments of the European Court of Human Rights Nine cases against the Russian Federation, available at: <https://hudoc.exec.coe.int/eng?i=001-207280>:

legislation pointed out the need to establish the significance of the influence of a mental health issue on the ability of an individual to understand the meaning of his/her actions and (or) manage them.²⁰

In Lithuania, the legal framework governing the legal incapacitation procedure and safeguarding the rights of persons with mental health issues was reformed in 2016, inter alia by amendments to the CC, the CPC and the Law on the State Guaranteed Legal Aid, to allow courts to declare a person suffering from mental health issues, legally incapacitated only in a certain area of his life. In such cases, the court should provide a definitive list of areas where the person declared with limited legal capacity cannot act independently.²¹ Following these amendments, the Ministers closed the case.²² In some of the above-mentioned states, the full deprivation of legal capacity and the plenary guardianship are still in force.

According to another model, some of the Council of Europe member states abolished the full deprivation of legal capacity and left only the possibility of restricting the legal capacity with a focus on limiting the autonomy in making transactions. For instance, according to the General Part of the Civil Code Act of Estonia, persons who, due to mental health issues, are permanently unable to understand or direct their actions have restricted active legal capacity. The restricted active legal capacity of an adult affects the validity of the transactions entered into by the person only to the extent to which he or she cannot understand or direct his or her actions. If a guardian is appointed by a court to this person, he/she is presumed to have restricted active legal capacity to the extent to which a guardian has been appointed to him/her.²³

The court thus no longer declares anybody to be without active legal capacity, but instead identifies a person as having restricted active legal capacity where necessary. Restricted active legal capacity is thus an objective status. Estonia has proceeded from the principle that it is not democratic to regard or declare anyone as having no active legal capacity whatsoever. Even a person who is mentally disturbed should be granted certain rights that he or she can exercise independently. The person's ability to do so depends on the specific circumstances.²⁴ A similar approach is established in Austria.²⁵

²⁰ CC of Ukraine, Article 36, available at: <https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/en/435-15#Text>.

²¹ Action Report (14 February 2020) of the *D.D. vs Lithuania* (Application No. 13469/06), available at: <https://hudoc.exec.coe.int/?i=004-4336>.

²² CM/ResDH(2020)267 Execution of the judgment of the European Court of Human Rights *D.D. vs Lithuania*, available at: <https://hudoc.exec.coe.int/?i=001-206922>.

²³ General Part of the Civil Code Act of Estonia, Article 8, available at: <https://www.riigiteataja.ee/en/eli/528082015004/consolide>.

²⁴ "Restrictions on Active Legal Capacity", Paul Varul, Anu Avi and Triin Kvirisild, available at: https://www.juridicainternational.eu/public/pdf/ji_2004_1_99.pdf.

²⁵ General Civil Code of Austria, Articles 21 and 24, available at: <https://www.ris.bka.gv.at/GeltendeFassung.wxe?Abfrage=Bundesnormen&Gesetzesnummer=10001622>.

According to the CC of Switzerland, a person has legal capacity within the meaning of the law if he or she does not lack the capacity to act rationally by virtue of having mental health issues. A person cannot act independently if he/she is legally incapable or is subject to a general guardianship. Persons who are legally capable, but lack the capacity to act may only enter into obligations or give up rights with the consent of their legal representative. Without such consent, they may only accept advantages that are free of charge or carry out minor everyday transactions. They are liable for damages for unpermitted acts.²⁶ This means that Swiss legislation does not prescribe the full deprivation of legal capacity but only restricts a certain financial nature.

CC of Germany specifies that persons who are in a state of pathological mental disorder that precludes the free formation of will if such condition is not temporary by nature have no active legal capacity. Suppose a person of full age incapable of contracting enters into an everyday transaction that can be effected with funds of low value. In that case, the contract he enters into is regarded as effective with regard to performance and, if agreed, consideration as soon as performance has been effected and consideration rendered. This does not apply in the case of considerable danger to the person or the property of the person incapable of contracting.²⁷ The deprivation of legal capacity does not, therefore, exist under German law. Limited guardianship exists where it is considered that it is necessary for a particular domain of decision-making (for example health and personal welfare, property and financial affairs).²⁸

According to the CC of the Czech Republic, it is impossible to deprive a person of legal capacity fully, and any restriction of legal capacity is to be viewed only as an option of last resort. For such a restriction to be imposed, the following two conditions must be met: that individual would otherwise be under a threat of serious harm; milder and less restrictive measures would not suffice to protect his/her interests. The limits on the legal capacity of the individual are, therefore, confined to the particular area in which it has been decided that he or she “lacks” legal capacity.²⁹ The CPC stipulates that “a court may limit the legal capacity of an individual to the extent to which the individual is unable to make juridical acts due to a mental disorder which is not only temporary, and shall define the extent to which it has limited the capacity of the individual to make independent juridical acts”.³⁰

The third model is mixing the restriction of legal capacity with the system of support in decision-making. The CC of Georgia, following the decision of the Constitutional Court of Georgia,

²⁶ CC of Switzerland, Articles 17, 18, 19, 19a-19d, available at: https://www.fedlex.admin.ch/eli/cc/24/233_245_233/en#art_17.

²⁷ CC of Germany, Articles 104, 105 and 105a, available at: <https://www.fd.ulisboa.pt/wp-content/uploads/2014/12/Codigo-Civil-Alemao-BGB-German-Civil-Code-BGB-english-version.pdf>.

²⁸ “A study on Equal Recognition before the law”, Contribution towards the Council of Europe Strategy on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, available at: <https://edoc.coe.int/en/people-with-disabilities/7277-pdf-a-study-on-the-equal-recognition-before-the-law-contribution-towards-the-council-of-europe-strategy-on-the-rights-of-persons-with-disabilities.html>.

²⁹ Ibid.

³⁰ CPC of the Czech Republic, Section 57 (1), available at: <http://obcanskyzakonik.justice.cz/images/pdf/Civil-Code.pdf>.

was amended and now provides that “[s]upport shall be established for a beneficiary of support”. There is, therefore, an assumption that legal capacity is not to be removed, and systems of support must instead be established to ensure that that legal capacity can be exercised. The CC provides that a court may make a declaration which declares a person as a “beneficiary of support”, may assign a supporter, and define the limits of support and the rights and duties of the supporter. The CC does provide for “exceptional cases” where it is “objectively impossible for a supporter to declare the intent of a beneficiary of support for more than one month, and that the prohibition of making a decision instead of the beneficiary of support can significantly prejudice him/her” where the court may authorise the supporter to conclude “necessary” transactions on behalf of the beneficiary of support and based on his/her interests”. It was interpreted that this provision would only be applicable in cases where a person is in a coma for more than a month, and their property is under some threat, leading to the need for a legal representative to make decisions in relation to these interests.³¹

Pilot projects on supported decision-making have been carried out in several Council of Europe member states. They have occurred in two contexts: as part of a law reform process and to “build the case” for law reform. These states are the Czech Republic, Latvia and Bulgaria.³²

The last option is an assisted decision-making system without the restriction of the legal capacity of a person on the grounds of mental health issues, which exists in Ireland. The Irish legislation stipulates regulations on appointing a “decision-making assistant” to help persons with mental health issues make decisions regarding their “personal welfare or property and affairs”. An assistant is not entitled to decide on behalf of the appointer.³³

It should be noted that a number of the Council of Europe institutions are promoting the transition from the traditional guardianship system to supported decision-making. The Council of Europe has been actively addressing the rights of persons with disabilities regarding legal capacity, demonstrating a consistent human rights progression. It endeavours to align its instruments with global human rights standards through interpretive practices and evolutive approaches. For example, the member states are urged by the Ministers to ensure that persons with disabilities enjoy equal rights to participate in political and public life, including the right to vote and stand for election, without discrimination based on their disability or perceived capacity, in alignment with international conventions and case law.³⁴

In Resolution 1642 (2009), the Council of Europe Parliamentary Assembly emphasises the importance of ensuring that persons with disabilities retain and exercise legal capacity on an equal

³¹ Ibid.

³² Ibid.

³³ Ibid.

³⁴ Ibid.

basis with others. It calls for tailored measures and support for decision-making while recognising the rights of individuals placed under guardianship, including safeguards against abuse. Despite permitting certain forms of substitute decision-making under certain circumstances, the resolution prioritises individual autonomy and the need for support.³⁵

The Council of Europe Commissioner for Human Rights highlighted in 2012 Issue Paper recommended the Council of Europe member states to review existing legislation, abolish full incapacitation and plenary guardianship mechanisms, ensure the right to challenge guardianship, develop supported decision-making alternatives, and involve persons with disabilities in reform processes. The paper underscored the need to transition from substituted decision-making to support-based models while providing immediate procedural safeguards for individuals whose legal capacity had been removed, pending legislative reforms by member states.³⁶

The study of the European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights on the “Legal capacity of persons with intellectual disabilities and persons with mental health problems” provides more country-specific experiences on this matter.³⁷

Turning back to the Armenian context, as was highlighted during the expert discussions and the interviews, it is desirable to carry out the reforms of the field in a “step-by-step” form. This means the current challenges, for instance, the lack of capacity and human resources of the guardianship and trusteeship authorities on the local levels, shortcomings in conflict-free guardianship and proper monitoring, should be considered, and feasible solutions should be provided.

Taking into account the observations of the Court in the judgement *Nikolyan vs Armenia* and the case law in general, the Council of Europe standards and the experience of different Council of Europe member states, as well as the country-specific context, it is recommended to carry out a comprehensive legislative reform in the CC of the Republic of Armenia and CPC of the Republic of Armenia and ensure a tailor-made system of restricting the legal capacity of people with mental health issues. This can be done in the frame of the mechanism of limited legal capacity, as it is other members of the Council of Europe. The pros of such a model are that the possibility of restricting the legal capacity will be connected to certain rights, as it is in the other Council of Europe member states discussed above.

³⁵ Resolution 1642 (2009), the Council of Europe Parliamentary Assembly, Principle 7, available at: <https://assembly.coe.int/nw/xml/XRef/Xref-XML2HTML-en.asp?fileid=17697&lang=en>.

³⁶ “Who gets to decide? Right to legal capacity for persons with intellectual and psychosocial disabilities” Issue Paper of the Council of Europe Commissioner for Human Rights, available at: <https://rm.coe.int/16806da5c0>.

³⁷ European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights, “Legal capacity of Persons with intellectual disabilities and persons with mental health problems”, Pages 27-32, available at: <https://fra.europa.eu/en/publication/2013/legal-capacity-persons-intellectual-disabilities-and-persons-mental-health>.

The establishment of a tailor-made system of restricting the legal capacity of people with mental health issues should be not only established in the law, but also effectively implemented in practice. Nevertheless, in the case of such legislative reform, for its proper implementation in legal practice, following the amendments to the CC of the Republic of Armenia and CPC of the Republic of Armenia, it will be necessary, for example, to adopt specific guidelines on the limitation of individual rights based on the level of a person's mental capacity and to implement joint capacity enhancement measures for judges and psychiatric experts, which will also be aimed at to the formation of interaction.

Except for the step recommended to be implemented for the purpose of execution of *Nikolyan vs Armenia* above, it is suggested to improve the field further through the following proposals, which will need further research and analysis:

- In the first stage of the reform, the full deprivation of legal capacity may remain. However, following the preparedness of the mental health system, the automatic deprivation of legal capacity is advisable to abolish. This will entail the examination of restricting the rights one by one, without the possibility of automatic deprivation of legal capacity.**
- Following the legislative reforms, piloting the supported decision-making mechanism is also recommended. However, the system's readiness should be properly measured, and the capacity of responsible entities, such as the guardianship and trusteeship body, should be enhanced.**

Assessment of legal capacity and “sufficiently recent” expert opinion

According to the Court case law, the restriction of legal capacity should be properly justified. This involves presenting compelling evidence that the person cannot provide for their own needs or poses a threat to the rights or interests of others.³⁸ The justification should not be of a general nature but sufficiently concrete.³⁹ Undoubtedly, one of the most important pieces of evidence is the expert opinion of forensic psychiatrists requested by the courts.

In the scope of this analysis, it is crucial to distinguish between legal capacity and mental capacity. Legal capacity and mental capacity are distinct concepts. Legal capacity is the ability to hold rights and duties (legal standing) and to exercise these rights and duties (legal agency). It is the key to accessing meaningful participation in society. Mental capacity refers to a person’s decision-making skills, which naturally vary from one person to another and may be different for a given person depending on many factors, including environmental and social factors.⁴⁰ Indeed, mental capacity and legal capacity are closely linked: while deciding on the legal capacity of the person, mental capacity is assessed.

Though this is done by forensic experts, the process has other actors, in particular judges. Judges are the responsible authority to make a decision on the legal capacity of the person with mental health issues. In practice, the judges may rely on the expert opinion of forensic examination, but this should not serve as the only evidence; rather, it should be discussed in the general context with others.

In the case of *Ivinović vs Croatia*, the Court noted that the decision to deprive the applicant of her legal capacity partly relied to a decisive extent on the report drawn up by two psychiatrists. The Court flagged its awareness of the relevance of medical reports concerning persons suffering from impairment in their mental faculties and agrees that any decision based on an assessment of a person’s mental health has to be supported by relevant medical documents.

³⁸ *X and Y vs Croatia* (Application No. 5193/09, judgment 3 February 2012), available at: <https://hudoc.echr.coe.int/eng?i=001-107303>.

³⁹ *M.S. vs Croatia* (Application No 36337/10, judgement 25 April 2013), available at: <https://hudoc.echr.coe.int/eng#%22docname%22:%22M.S.%22,%22documentcollectionid%22:%22GRANDCHAMBER%22,%22CHAMBER%22,%22itemid%22:%22001-118736%22>];

⁴⁰ General comment No. 1 (2014) Article 12: Equal recognition before the law, CRPD, Paragraph 12, available at: <https://www.ohchr.org/en/documents/general-comments-and-recommendations/general-comment-no-1-article-12-equal-recognition-1>.

However, the judge and not a physician must assess all relevant facts concerning the person in question and his or her personal circumstances. It is the function of the judge conducting the proceedings to decide whether such an extreme measure is necessary or whether a less stringent measure might suffice. When such an important interest in an individual's private life is at stake, a judge has to carefully balance all relevant factors to assess the proportionality of the measure to be taken.⁴¹

It is essential to consider the collaboration of forensic experts and courts ruling on the legal capacity of the person concerned. In particular, it should be observed what questions were raised by the court and whether the expert medical report covers those questions. In *Sýkora vs Czech Republic*, the Court considers that any deprivation or limitation of legal capacity must be based on sufficiently reliable and conclusive evidence. An expert medical report should explain what kind of actions the applicant is unable to understand or control and what the consequences of his illness are for his social life, health, pecuniary interests, and so on. The degree of the applicant's incapacity should be addressed in sufficient detail by the medical reports.⁴²

However, the role of a judge is also important and affects the content of the medical report. It is also important for the court to put a relevant and targeted question for the examination of the medical experts, which will further impact the decision about the legal capacity of the person concerned. In the case of *A.N. vs Lithuania*, the Court observed that the questions to the doctor, as formulated by the judge, did not concern "the kind and degree" of the applicant's mental illness.⁴³

In *Nikolyan vs Armenia*, the Court ruled that the objectivity of medical evidence required it to be "sufficiently recent". Whether the evidence was sufficiently recent depended on the case's specific. In the specific case, the psychiatric expert opinion had been issued more than fourteen months before the judgment, declaring the applicant incapable and almost a year and a half before the decision of the Civil Court of Appeal of the Republic of Armenia upholding that judgment. Thus, the Court considered that the opinion could not be regarded as "up to date".

The Rec (99)4 of the Committee of Ministers to member states on principles concerning the legal protection of incapable adults also contains procedural safeguards about the restriction of legal capacity. In particular, there should be adequate procedures for the investigation and assessment of the adult's personal faculties. No measure of protection which restricts the legal capacity of an incapable adult should be taken unless the person taking the measure has seen the adult or is personally satisfied with the adult's condition and an up-to-date report from at least

⁴¹ *Ivinović vs Croatia* (Application No. 13006/13, judgment 18 September 2014), available at: <https://hudoc.echr.coe.int/eng?i=001-146393>.

⁴² *Sýkora vs Czech Republic* (Application No. 23419/07, judgment 22 November 2012), available at: <https://hudoc.echr.coe.int/eng?i=001-114658>.

⁴³ *A.N. vs Lithuania*, (Application No. 17280/08, Judgement 31 May 2016), available at: <https://hudoc.echr.coe.int/?i=002-11075>.

one suitably qualified expert has been submitted. The report should be in writing or recorded in writing.⁴⁴

CPC of the Republic of Armenia stipulates a special chapter on the procedure of declaring a person legally incapable and with limited capacity and restoring legal capacity. According to those provisions, in the presence of reasonable suspicions regarding the mental health issues of a person, the court of first instance appoints a forensic psychiatric examination to find out the existence of grounds for recognising the person as legally incapable.⁴⁵ However, the legislation does not provide any further regulations. Judges do not have any guidance on what questions should be addressed to the experts to ensure individual approach and collect proper evidence regarding the concrete case.

According to the information collected during the interviews and expert discussions, the questions addressed by the judges to the experts are mainly of a rather general nature and sometimes repetitive. It seems that there is a lack of individual approach. There is also a lack of proactiveness from the end of the experts to provide a comprehensive analysis of the examination on the “kind of a degree” and actions that a person cannot understand or control and what the consequences of his/her illness are for his/her social life, etc.

Another issue reported during this assessment is that, within the procedure of deciding on the legal capacity of the person with mental health issues, judges mainly rely on expert opinions. This should not be the case. Though the expert opinion has a crucial role in the assessment process, judges should make the analysis more comprehensive, collecting and covering other evidence. For instance, it is important for the court to hear the person whose legal capacity is being assessed in person. According to the Court case law, in particular, the *Shtukaturov vs Russia*, the Court notes that the applicant played a double role in the proceedings: he was an interested party and, at the same time, the main object of the court’s examination. His participation was, therefore, necessary not only to enable him to present his own case, but also to allow the judge to form her personal opinion about the applicant’s mental capacity.

Furthermore, in the same case, the Court also observed that the applicant was indeed an individual with a history of psychiatric problems. From the materials of the case, however, it appears that despite his mental illness, he had been a relatively autonomous person. In such circumstances, it was indispensable for the judge to have at least a brief visual contact with the applicant and preferably to question him. The Court concludes that the decision of the judge to decide the case based on documentary evidence without seeing or hearing the applicant was

⁴⁴ Rec (99)4 of the Committee of Ministers to member states on principles concerning the legal protection of incapable adults, Principle 12, available at: <https://search.coe.int/cm?i=09000016805e303c>.

⁴⁵ CPC, Article 252 (1), available at: <https://www.arlis.am/DocumentView.aspx?DocID=190625>.

unreasonable and in breach of the principle of adversarial proceedings enshrined in Article 6 (1) of the Convention.⁴⁶

It should be noted that following the reforms of the CPC of the Republic of Armenia, the presence of the person whose legal capacity is being assessed is envisaged.⁴⁷ Hence, the issues related to the assessment of the legal capacity of a person with mental health issues are generally practical. This issue has no legislative solution. Such a solution will contain risks of deepening the general approach and lacking individual one.

Therefore, for the purpose of ensuring the implementation of legislative provisions in line with the Court case law in practice, it is recommended to:

- **Adopt guidance notes or other documents that give judges proper advice on what questions should be asked for forensic medical examination. Those papers need to cover the principles of addressing the questions to the forensic experts on the mental capacity of the person whose legal capacity restriction is being discussed. The aim of such a guidance note for the court will be to put a relevant and targeted question for the examination of the medical experts, which will further impact the decision about the legal capacity of the person concerned. Another important part of this document should be collecting other evidence (for example, medical reports, opinions of local authorities) and comprehensive assessment.**
- **Based on the adopted documents, capacity-building activities for judges and psychiatric forensic experts should be carried out. It would be advisable to incorporate such training into the regular training programme of judges and their candidates at the Academy of Justice of the Republic of Armenia. The possibility of conducting a mixed group training of judges and psychiatric forensic experts is suggested.**

⁴⁶ *Shtukaturvov vs Russia* (Application No. 44009/05, judgement 27 March 2008), available at: <https://hudoc.echr.coe.int/eng?i=001-85611>.

⁴⁷ CPC, Article 251 (1), available at: <https://www.arlis.am/DocumentView.aspx?DocID=190625>.

Review of restriction of legal capacity

As it was already discussed, the domestic legislation does not envisage a restriction of legal capacity for persons with mental health issues but full incapacity. According to the relevant regulations of the CPC and CC of the Republic of Armenia, the restoration of legal capacity can be initiated by the application of a person recognised as incapable, his/her guardian, family member or a psychiatric organisation. The restoration of legal capacity is possible if the grounds for deprivation are not there, and it should be based on the appropriate conclusion of a forensic psychiatric examination on recognising the person as legally capable. In case of lifting the deprivation of legal capacity, based on the final judicial act of the court, the guardianship established for the person is being abolished.⁴⁸

The issue of “right to court” in the case of persons with mental health issues arises, particularly about their access to court for restoration of their legal capacity. The reforms of the CPC of the Republic of Armenia, carried out after the respective decision of the Court of the Republic of Armenia, envisage the possibility for the person deprived of legal capacity to apply to the court for its restoration. This is also true for persons whose legal capacity is restricted.⁴⁹ The issue was observed also in *Nikolyan vs Armenia* judgement. This reform carried out before this judgement, aligns with the Court case law.

In particular, in *Stanev vs Bulgaria*, the Court acknowledged that restrictions on a person’s procedural rights, even where the person has been only partially deprived of legal capacity, may be justified for the person’s own protection, the protection of the interests of others and the proper administration of justice. However, considering that the right to ask a court to review a declaration of incapacity is one of the most important rights for the person concerned since such a procedure, once initiated, will be decisive for the exercise of all the rights and freedoms affected by the declaration of incapacity, the Court, considered that this right is one of the fundamental procedural rights for the protection of those who have been partially deprived of legal capacity.

Moreover, the Court highlighted that in the light of the foregoing, in particular the trends emerging in national legislation and the relevant international instruments, Article 6 (1) of the Convention must be interpreted as guaranteeing in principle that anyone who has been declared partially incapable, has direct access to a court to seek restoration of his or her legal capacity. The Court noted that a comparative study of the domestic law of twenty Council of Europe member

⁴⁸ CPC, Article 255 (1), available at: <https://www.arlis.am/DocumentView.aspx?DocID=190625>. Civil Code, Article 31 (3), available at: <https://www.arlis.am/DocumentView.aspx?DocID=186960>.

⁴⁹ CPC, Article 255 (2), available at: <https://www.arlis.am/DocumentView.aspx?DocID=190625>.

states indicates that in the vast majority of cases (Croatia, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Luxembourg, Monaco, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Slovakia, Sweden, Switzerland and Turkey) the law entitles anyone who has been deprived of legal capacity to apply directly to the courts for discontinuation of the measure. So, the Court considered the right to access the court for legally incapable persons to restore their capacity somewhat absolute.

In the given case, the applicant, who has been partially deprived of legal capacity, complained that Bulgarian law did not afford him direct access to a court to apply to restore his capacity. The Court needs to clarify that proceedings for restoration of legal capacity are directly decisive for the determination of “civil rights and obligations”; thus, Article 6 (1) of the Convention is applicable in those cases. The Court observed that, as far as access to court is concerned, domestic law made no distinction between those who were entirely deprived of legal capacity and those who, like the applicant, are only partially incapacitated. Moreover, domestic legislation did not allow for automatic periodic review of whether the grounds for placing a person under guardianship remain valid. Lastly, in the applicant’s case, the measure in question was not limited in time. Therefore, in this particular case, the Court found a violation of Article 6 (1).⁵⁰

Another important step was free legal aid for both groups to restore their legal capacity. Nevertheless, it is necessary to emphasise that the discussed groups are absent from the list of persons receiving free legal aid according to the “Law on Advocacy” of the Republic of Armenia on Advocacy.⁵¹ The study of statistical data and domestic court cases shows that this mechanism is ineffective in practice. It may be related, for example, to improper notification of persons recognised as incompetent. This can be linked to two major issues: unawareness of persons declared legally incapable and their guardians and lack of conflict-free guardianship when guardians will not be interested in the restoration of the legal capacity of the person.

In this frame, the experience of Poland might be useful. In particular, according to Polish legislation, a court shall appoint an ex-officio lawyer for a person who is directly affected by the proceedings, even if she/he has not applied for a lawyer, in case such a person is not able to apply for a lawyer because of her/his mental health state and the court assesses that participation of a lawyer in the proceedings is needed. An ex-officio lawyer will also be appointed for a person admitted to a psychiatric hospital or a social care home without her/his consent.⁵²

There is no other procedure for restoring the legal capacity of a person declared legally incapable or his/her capacity was limited other than the one described above. Domestic legislation does not

⁵⁰ *Stanev vs Bulgaria* (Application No. 36760/06), judgment 17 January 2012), available at: <https://hudoc.echr.coe.int/?i=002-129>.

⁵¹ “Law on Advocacy” of the Republic of Armenia, Article 41 (5), available at: <https://www.arlis.am/DocumentView.aspx?DocID=186162>.

⁵² Action Report (28 May 2018) of the *K.C. and Kedzior vs Poland* (Applications No. 31199/12, 45026/07), available at: [https://hudoc.exec.coe.int/?i=DH-DD\(2018\)332-revE](https://hudoc.exec.coe.int/?i=DH-DD(2018)332-revE).

prescribe a review of the legal capacity of a person declared legally incapable or his/her capacity at reasonable intervals. Furthermore, the legislation also does not oblige courts to prescribe by their decisions a duration for restricting the legal capacity or its deprivation. It strongly contradicts the important principle of applying limited and necessary duration for the protection measures restricting the rights of person with mental health issues.

In particular, in *Nataliya Mikhaylenko vs Ukraine*, the Court criticised that the domestic law does not provide safeguards to the effect that the matter of restoration of legal capacity is to be reviewed by a court at reasonable intervals. In the given case, the Court noted that the applicant's inability to seek the restoration of her legal capacity directly resulted in that matter not being examined by the courts. The absence of judicial review of that issue, which seriously affected many aspects of the applicant's life, could not be justified by the legitimate aims underpinning the limitations on access to a court by incapacitated persons. The facts of the present case lead the Court to conclude that the situation in which the applicant was placed amounted to a denial of justice as regards the possibility of securing a review of her legal capacity. Therefore, there has been a violation of Article 6 (1) of the Convention.⁵³

Following this judgement, as described in the action report presented by the Ukrainian authorities on *Nataliya Mikhaylenko vs Ukraine*, at the request of the Ministry of Social Policy of Ukraine, the Ministry of Justice of Ukraine provided an explanatory statement for the relevant authorities and the courts concerning the application of the relevant article of the CPC of Ukraine. According to this statement, the validity of a decision declaring a physical person's incapacity shall be determined by the court, but cannot exceed two years. Thus, the period of declaring a physical person incapable ends the day following the expiry of the period for recognition of a person incapable, specified in the court decision. The court decision shall be considered as a title document in such cases.⁵⁴ Following this action report, the Ministers closed the examination of this case.⁵⁵

According to the action report on *D.D. vs Lithuania*, in Lithuania, the legal framework governing the legal incapacitation procedure and safeguarding the rights of persons with mental disabilities was reformed in 2016, including by amendments to the CC, the CPC and the Law on the State Guaranteed Legal Aid, *inter alia*, to oblige the courts to restore legal capacity if the person's health improves, so that full incapacitation would be envisaged as ultima ratio only. A request to declare a person legally incapacitated in a certain area may be submitted by his spouse, parents or adult

⁵³ *Nataliya Mikhaylenko vs Ukraine* (Application No. 49069/11), judgment 30 August 2013), available at: <https://hudoc.echr.coe.int/eng?i=001-119975>.

⁵⁴ Action Report (8 August 2008) of the *Nataliya Mikhaylenko vs Ukraine* (Application No. 49069/11), available at: [https://hudoc.exec.coe.int/eng?i=DH-DD\(2019\)896E](https://hudoc.exec.coe.int/eng?i=DH-DD(2019)896E).

⁵⁵ CM/ResDH(2019)324 Execution of the judgment of the European Court of Human Rights *Nataliya Mikhaylenko* against Ukraine, available at: <https://hudoc.exec.coe.int/eng?i=001-199603>.

children, a care institution or a prosecutor, who may also request that the court restore legal capacity. Such requests for restoration of legal capacity may be lodged no more than once per year and also by the person declared legally incapacitated himself/herself. It may also be lodged by the Incapacitated Persons' Review Commission, a new independent body to be established in every municipality. The amended CC also provides a possibility to appeal against acts of the guardian and to initiate proceedings to dismiss him from his office.⁵⁶ The Ministers decided to close the examination of this case.⁵⁷

Problems related to excessively frequent applications should not be solved by denying access altogether. Instead, the number of complaints within certain time frames could be limited.⁵⁸ The application of a period of three years within which no application for restoration of legal capacity can be made has nevertheless been deemed too restrictive by the Court.⁵⁹ In sum, this means that persons under guardianship regimes must also retain legal capacity to apply for restoration of their full legal capacity within a reasonable period of time.

The Recommendation No. R (99)4 of the Ministers to member states on principles concerning the legal protection of incapable adults also states the importance of restoring the legal capacity as soon as there are no grounds. In particular, it stipulates that protection measures should be of limited duration whenever possible and appropriate. Consideration should be given to the institution of periodical reviews. Protection measures should be reviewed in a change of circumstances, particularly in the adult's condition. They should be terminated if their conditions are no longer fulfilled.⁶⁰

The Explanatory Report of the above-mentioned Recommendation commends that measures of protection should not be established for an indefinite duration unless this is necessary or appropriate in the interests of the adult concerned, for instance, when the adult who needs the appointment of a representative suffers from senile dementia from which there is no possibility of recovery. Consideration should be given to the institution of periodical reviews of any measure of protection taken unless the measure of protection is of fixed and short duration. The periodicity of such a review could be fixed, for example, by the authority establishing the measure of protection. The national law should determine the persons entitled to demand a review of measures of protection. In this respect, the adult concerned should be entitled to demand such a review.

⁵⁶ Action Report (13 January 2020) of the *D.D. vs Lithuania* (Application No. 13469/06), available at: [https://hudoc.exec.coe.int/?i=DH-DD\(2020\)145E](https://hudoc.exec.coe.int/?i=DH-DD(2020)145E).

⁵⁷ CM/ResDH(2020)267 Execution of the judgment of the European Court of Human Rights *D.D. vs Lithuania*, available at: <https://hudoc.exec.coe.int/?i=001-206922>.

⁵⁸ *Stanev vs Bulgaria* (Application No. 36760/06), judgment 17 January 2012), available at: <https://hudoc.echr.coe.int/?i=002-129>.

⁵⁹ *Berková vs Slovakia* (Application No. 67149/01, judgement 24 June 2009), available at: <https://hudoc.echr.coe.int/rus?i=001-91802>.

⁶⁰ Recommendation No. R (99)4 of the Committee of Ministers to member states on principles concerning the legal protection of incapable adults, Principle 14, available at: https://search.coe.int/cm/Pages/result_details.aspx?ObjectID=09000016805e303c.

Taking into account the approach of the above-mentioned Recommendation, which recognises that there may be different degrees of incapacity, that incapacity may vary from time to time, and that, therefore, any measure of protection should be governed by the idea of the maximum preservation of capacity of the adult concerned – any change of circumstances and, above all, a change in the condition of the adult should lead to a review of measures of protection. Relevant changes of circumstances other than changes in the adult’s condition might include, for example, the inheritance of property by the adult or changes in the adult’s place of residence. Furthermore, if the conditions which determined the establishment of a measure of protection are no longer fulfilled, that measure should be terminated.⁶¹

Member states have different approaches in stipulating the duration of restriction of the legal capacity of the person with mental health issues. For example, according to the CPC of Ukraine, the validity period of the judgment on declaring an individual incapable shall be determined by a court, but may not exceed two years. The petition for an extension of the validity period of a judgment on recognition of an individual incapable should be submitted by a guardian, a representative of the guardianship authority, no later than fifteen days before the expiration of the period. The petition for an extension of the validity period shall contain circumstances indicating the continuation of a chronic, persistent mental disorder, as a result of which the person continues to be unaware of the significance of his/her actions and (or) manage them, confirmed by the conclusion of the forensic psychiatric expert examination.⁶²

According to the CPC of the Czech Republic, a court may limit the legal capacity in connection with a certain matter for a period necessary to arrange such matter or for an otherwise defined definite period not exceeding three years; legal effects of the limitation are extinguished upon the expiry of that period. However, if proceedings to extend the period of limitation are initiated within this period, the legal effects of the original decision shall last until a new decision has been made, but no longer than one year. If the circumstances change, a court shall, even of its own motion, change or cancel its decision without delay.⁶³

The CC of Georgia stipulates that limitation of legal capacity shall cease when the grounds for limitation of a person’s legal capacity no longer exist.⁶⁴ According to the CPC, in such cases, a court shall deliver a judgment to cancel a decision declaring a citizen as having limited legal capacity based on the application of the citizen him/herself, his/her guardian or a family member.⁶⁵

⁶¹ Explanatory Report to the Rec (99)4 of the Committee of Ministers to member states on principles concerning the legal protection of incapable adults, Paragraphs 56 and 57, available at: <https://rm.coe.int/09000016805e302a>.

⁶² CPC of Ukraine, Article 300, available at: <https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/en/1618-15#Text>.

⁶³ CPC of the Czech Republic, Sections 59 and 60, available at: <http://obcanskyzakonik.justice.cz/images/pdf/Civil-Code.pdf>.

⁶⁴ CC of Georgia, Article 14 (3), available at: <https://matsne.gov.ge/en/document/view/31702?publication=129>.

⁶⁵ CPC of Georgia, Article 327 (1), available at: <https://matsne.gov.ge/en/document/download/29962/92/en/pdf>.

The study of the European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights on the “Legal capacity of persons with intellectual disabilities and persons with mental health problems” provides more country-specific experiences on this matter.⁶⁶

Intervention to the right of a person with mental health issues through restriction of his/her legal capacity is made by the state, namely courts. It is the positive obligation of the authorities to closely follow the dynamic of the condition of mental health of this person as a result of the treatment provided by the state and assess the possibility of lifting some of the restrictions of legal capacity or restoring the legal capacity at large. The importance of bearing such duty is essential in the conditions of the ineffectiveness of the guardianship system and alleged conflict of interest from the end of guardians. In such conditions, the guardians may not be interested in reviewing the legal capacity.

- **Following the findings presented above and for the purpose of execution of the *Nikolyan vs Armenia* judgement, it is recommended to prescribe in the CPC of the Republic of Armenia the maximum duration of restriction of the legal capacity of a person with mental health issues and the obligation for the courts to provide a duration of restriction or deprivation and stipulate the maximum duration. This should also be based on the opinion provided by the psychiatric forensic expert. In all cases, the review of legal capacity should include an appointment for psychiatric examination, study of medical history, etc.**
- **Furthermore, in this frame, a mechanism of court supervision over the treatment of the person with mental health issues whose legal capacity was restricted can be established and restored as soon as the grounds for such restrictions are not present. The mechanism of reporting by the institutions providing treatment and the guardianship and trusteeship authority can be placed.**

⁶⁶ European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights, “Legal capacity of Persons with intellectual disabilities and persons with mental health problems”, Pages 37-39, available at: <https://fra.europa.eu/en/publication/2013/legal-capacity-persons-intellectual-disabilities-and-persons-mental-health>.

Guardianship and trusteeship system

The next question that the Court addressed in the *Nikolyan vs Armenia* judgment related to the effectiveness of the guardianship and trusteeship system. In particular, it was recorded in the judgment that the disagreements between the applicant and his son as a guardian were not taken into account, as well as the suspicion of the latter's impartiality and the improper investigation of the domestic court, even though the applicant himself applied to change the guardian with a question. Moreover, the problem was also discussed in the context of a general measure.

Therefore, to ensure the integrity of this analysis, it is necessary to address the efficiency of the guardianship and trusteeship system and the need for efficient and effective mechanisms to exclude possible conflicts of interest between the person whose legal capacity was restricted and the guardian. In this context, it is necessary to pay attention to the hearing of the person recognised as incapable by the guardianship and trusteeship body and the right to appeal the decision made by that body in court.

According to the CC of the Republic of Armenia, guardianship is established for persons recognised by the court as legally incapable due to mental health issues. Within three days after the entry into legal force of the final judicial act declaring a person legally incapable or restricting his/her capacity, the court sends it to the guardianship and trusteeship body of the person's place of residence to establish guardianship or trusteeship over him. A guardian or trustee is appointed by the guardianship and trusteeship body of the place of residence of a person in need of guardianship and trusteeship within one month, starting from the day the body became aware of the need to establish guardianship or trusteeship over a citizen. For a person in need of guardianship or trusteeship, until a guardian or trustee is appointed, the guardianship and trusteeship body performs the duties of the guardian or trustee.⁶⁷ The head of the community is empowered to establish guardianship and trusteeship.⁶⁸ In other words, the heads of the community exercise the powers of guardianship and trustee bodies. In Yerevan, these powers are exercised by the heads of the administrative districts of the city of Yerevan.

A guardianship and trusteeship commission is established as an adjunct to the guardianship and trusteeship bodies, a consultative body that operates pro bono. From three to nine people can be included in the commission. The commission may include employees of the structural

⁶⁷ CC, Article 34 (1), Article 36 (2) and Article 37 (1), available at: <https://www.arlis.am/DocumentView.aspx?DocID=186960>. CPC of the Republic of Armenia, Article 254 (2), available at: <https://www.arlis.am/DocumentView.aspx?DocID=190625>.

⁶⁸ Law on Local Self-Government Bodies of the Republic of Armenia, Article 36 (2) (2), available at: <https://www.arlis.am/DocumentView.aspx?docid=193167>.

units of the staff of regional governors (Yerevan: Yerevan Municipality), territorial centres, community employees of the municipal administration, health workers, community pedagogues, psychologists, social work specialists and lawyers, employees of the specialised unit of the Police, as well as representatives of NGOs, upon their consent.⁶⁹

The functions of the guardianship and trusteeship body include supervision of the activities of guardians and trustees, including monitoring and examining applications and complaints about actions or inaction of guardians and trustees. Furthermore, the guardianship and trusteeship body can also relieve the guardian or trustee from his/her duties. Among the reasons, the statute stipulates cases of improper performance of his/her duties by the guardian or trustee, including using the guardianship or trusteeship for profit purposes or leaving the guardian without supervision and necessary assistance, while taking necessary measures to bring him/her to the responsibility established by law. It also allows the guardian to make transactions around the incapacitated person's property and provides support on treatment and arrangements over rest.⁷⁰

Based on the Decision of the Government of the Republic of Armenia to approve the guardianship and trusteeship bodies statute, the Minister of Labour and Social Affairs approved a methodological guide on the activities of the guardianship and trusteeship commissions adjunct to the guardianship and trusteeship bodies. The purpose of the guide is to provide practical support to the guardianship and trusteeship bodies to ensure the protection of the rights and legal interests of children and persons declared legally incapable or with limited capacity within the framework of the powers assigned to them by the legislation. However, the methodological guide does not provide detailed guidance for the rights protection of persons declared legally incapable or with limited capacity; rather, it focuses on children.⁷¹

In this context, the decision No. VD/0477/05/15 of the Court of Cassation of the Republic of Armenia should be considered.⁷² Referring to the nature of the decision to appoint a guardian for a person recognised as incapable by the guardianship and trusteeship body, the Court of Cassation recorded that it is an administrative act. Therefore, the decision of the guardianship and trusteeship body to appoint a guardian for a person recognised as incapable, as an administrative act, is subject to appeal under the procedure established by the Code of Administrative Procedure

⁶⁹ CC, Article 37 (1), available at: <https://www.arlis.am/DocumentView.aspx?DocID=186960>.

Decision N 631-N of 2 June 2016 of the RA Government on approving the statute of the guardianship and trusteeship bodies on recognition of void of the Decision N 164-N of 24 February 2011 of the RA Government, Paragraphs 11, 12 and 14, available at: <https://www.arlis.am/DocumentView.aspx?DocID=152354>.

⁷⁰ *Ibid.*, Paragraph 9.

⁷¹ Decree No N 12-A/1 of 31 June 2017 of the Minister of Labour and Social Affairs on approving a methodological guide on the activities of the guardianship and trusteeship commissions adjunct to the guardianship and trusteeship bodies, available at: <https://www.irtek.am/views/act.aspx?aid=96439>.

⁷² Decision No VD/0477/05/15 of the Court of Cassation dated 28 September 2016, available at: https://iravaban.net/wp-content/uploads/2016/10/VD-0477-05-15-ANGORCUNAK-mijankyal.pdf?fbclid=IwAR2I7pusZdVd8KGe8BSmhHvEg358sRtnaD_ssiIDKXgEwM09vCmb9d5IISs.

of the Republic of Armenia. The possibility of appealing against the decision of the guardianship and trusteeship body is envisaged by the CC of the Republic of Armenia and the statute of the guardianship and trusteeship bodies.⁷³

In its decision, the Court of Cassation commented on the provisions of the CC of the Republic of Armenia. In particular, the court also noted that the mentioned procedure enables interested persons to request a change of guardian. The court considered that the question of whether a person recognised as legally incapable is included in the scope of interested persons provided for in Article 37 of the CC of the Republic of Armenia, who can initiate a judicial appeal of the guardianship decision or not, is subject to clarification. It ruled that a person with mental health issues who is declared legally incapable must have the opportunity to be heard in person in cases concerning the establishment of guardianship over him/her to express his/her point of view since the making of the said decision is no less important for the latter, taking into account that the protection of his rights and interests must be carried out exclusively through the guardian. Hence, the Court of Cassation ruled that the person declared legally incapable should not only have the right to appeal against the decision to appoint a guardian, but also must have the opportunity to participate fully in the proceedings and exercise his/her rights.⁷⁴

After the mentioned conclusion, it is necessary to discuss whether the regulations required to ensure this legal position of the Court of Cassation are provided by the legislation of administrative proceedings. According to the Code of Administrative Procedure of the Republic of Armenia, each natural or legal person has the right to apply to an administrative court. The ability to have judicial rights and bear judicial duties (judicial capacity) is recognised equally for all natural and legal entities. Nevertheless, it is also stated that the rights and freedoms of persons recognised as legally incapable are represented in the trial by their guardians. During the examination of the case, persons recognised as having limited legal capacity have the right to be heard. The court may grant the right to be heard during the case investigation to a person declared legally incapable.⁷⁵

It turns out that although a person declared legally incapable or with limited capacity can theoretically apply to the administrative court on his/her own and challenge the decision of the guardianship and trusteeship body, nevertheless, not having the legal capacity and functional capacity, his rights and freedoms will be represented in the trial by a legal representative. In other

⁷³ Decision N 631-N of 2 June 2016 of the RA Government on approving the statute of the guardianship and trusteeship bodies on recognition of void of the Decision N 164-N of 24 February 2011 of the RA Government, Paragraphs 6, available at: <https://www.arlis.am/DocumentView.aspx?DocID=152354>.

⁷⁴ Decision NoVD/0477/05/15 of the Court of Cassation dated 28 September 2016, available at: https://iravaban.net/wp-content/uploads/2016/10/VD-0477-05-15-ANGORCUNAK-mijankyal.pdf?fbclid=IwAR2I7pusZdVd8KGe8BSmhHvEg358sRtnaD_ssilDKxgEwM09vCmb9d5IISs.

⁷⁵ Administrative Procedure Code, Article 3 (1) and Article 4 (1), (6) (7), available at: <https://www.arlis.am/DocumentView.aspx?DocID=193219>.

words, if a person recognised as legally incapable appeals the decision to appoint a guardian, for example, based on a conflict of interests between him/her and the guardian, he/she will be represented in court by his legal representative, the guardian himself/herself.

According to international standards, guaranteeing conflict-free guardianship for persons declared legally incapable and proper monitoring and supervision should be among the core functions of the guardianship authorities. This function must be provided by the legislation and adequately implemented in practice. The importance of proper engagement and the right to appeal to the person over whom the guardian will be appointed is also highlighted.

In the case of *N. vs Romania* (no. 2), the Court considered that the decision-making process for the applicant's change of legal guardian had not been accompanied by adequate safeguards. The applicant had been excluded from the proceedings for the sole reason that he had been placed under guardianship. No consideration had been given to his capacity to understand the matter and express his preferences. Moreover, the reason for the change was insufficient, and the decision was disproportionate.

The Recommendation No. R (99)4 of the Ministers to member states on principles concerning the legal protection of incapable adults also contains relevant provisions about the representation and assistance of incapable adults, as well as control and limitations of such support. In particular, it states that steps should be taken to provide an adequate number of suitable qualified persons to represent and assist incapable adults. Consideration should be given to the need to ensure that any powers conferred on any person by operation of law, without the intervention of judicial or administrative authority, to act or take decisions on behalf of an incapable adult are limited and their exercise controlled. Furthermore, the recommendation also states that the national law should determine which juridical acts are of such a highly personal nature that they cannot be done by a representative.⁷⁶

The study of the European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights on the "Legal capacity of persons with intellectual disabilities and persons with mental health problems" provides more country-specific experiences on this matter.⁷⁷

The issues on the domestic level are strongly connected with the problem of conflict of interests between the guardian and the person declared legally incapable, which was reported during the interviews and expert discussions. In addition, as was mentioned, the guardianship and trusteeship commissions operate on a pro bono basis, and they lack sufficient capacity to

⁷⁶ Rec (99)4 of the Committee of Ministers to member states on principles concerning the legal protection of incapable adults, Principles 17-19, available at: https://search.coe.int/cm/Pages/result_details.aspx?ObjectID=09000016805e303c.

⁷⁷ European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights, "Legal capacity of Persons with intellectual disabilities and persons with mental health problems", Pages 33-37, available at: <https://fra.europa.eu/en/publication/2013/legal-capacity-persons-intellectual-disabilities-and-persons-mental-health>.

examine the risks of conflict of interest properly. Furthermore, the supervision and monitoring of guardianship is also not effective. It might be linked to the lack of guidance and capacity-building activities. Though the problem seems deeply rooted, it is not connected with legislative shortcomings. The issue is rather linked to the lack of human and other resources.

Taking into account the above-presented findings and for the purpose of execution of the *Nikolyan vs Armenia* judgement, it is recommended to supplement the Code of Administrative Procedure of the Republic of Armenia and provide for the right to appeal for a person recognised as legally incapable regarding the decision on appointing a guardian of the guardianship and trusteeship body, ensuring his rights as a person participating in the case. Nevertheless, considering the possible health problems associated with the person's ability to function and the difficulty of making independent decisions, it is proposed that the right to free legal aid be provided within the framework of administrative proceedings.

It is also recommended that the powers of the guardians over the property of the person declared legally incapable be limited, and initial approval of competent bodies is required depending on the scale of the property (guardianship and trusteeship body or court).

- **In order to ensure the implementation of legislative provisions in line with the case law of the Court, to exclude the possible conflict of interests between the guardian and the person declared legally incapable, and to effectively implement the control/monitoring function of the guardianship and trusteeship body, it is recommended to consider the establishment of periodic review of the guardianship, as well as the provision of necessary funds and the capabilities to the development of the guardianship and trusteeship body. It is also suggested that the decree of the Minister of Labour and Social Affairs be supplemented, as discussed in this chapter, providing guidance on the exclusion of conflict of interests and the supervision and monitoring of guardianship and trusteeship.**

www.coe.int

The Council of Europe is the continent's leading human rights organisation. It comprises 46 member states, including all members of the European Union. All Council of Europe member states have signed up to the European Convention on Human Rights, a treaty designed to protect human rights, democracy and the rule of law. The European Court of Human Rights oversees the implementation of the Convention in the member states.