



EUROPEAN COURT OF HUMAN RIGHTS
COUR EUROPÉENNE DES DROITS DE L'HOMME

Guide on Article 8 of the European Convention on Human Rights

Right to respect for private and family life,
home and correspondence

Updated on 31 August 2018

Publishers or organisations wishing to translate and/or reproduce all or part of this report in the form of a printed or electronic publication are invited to contact publishing@echr.coe.int for information on the authorisation procedure.

If you wish to know which translations of the Case-Law Guides are currently under way, please see [Pending translations](#).

This Guide has been prepared by the Directorate of the Jurisconsult and does not bind the Court. It may be subject to editorial revision.

This Guide was originally drafted in English. The text was finalised on 31 December 2016. It will be updated regularly as the case-law evolves. This update was finalised on 31 August 2018.

The Case-Law Guides are available for downloading at www.echr.coe.int (Case-law – Case-law analysis – Case-law guides). For publication updates please follow the Court’s Twitter account at <https://twitter.com/echrpublication>.

© Council of Europe/European Court of Human Rights, 2018

Table of contents

Note to readers.....	6
I. The structure of Article 8.....	7
A. The scope of Article 8	7
B. Should the case be assessed from the perspective of a negative or positive obligation?	8
C. In the case of a negative obligation, was the interference conducted “in accordance with the law”?.....	9
D. Does the interference further a legitimate aim?.....	10
E. Is the interference “necessary in a democratic society”?.....	11
F. Relation between Article 8 and other provisions of the Convention and its Protocols.....	11
1. Private and family life	11
a. Article 2 (right to life) and Article 3 (prohibition of torture)	11
b. Article 6 (right to a fair trial)	12
c. Article 9 (freedom of thought, conscience and religion)	13
d. Article 10 (freedom of expression).....	13
e. Article 14 (prohibition of discrimination)	14
2. Home and correspondence	15
a. Article 2 (right to life).....	15
b. Article 10 (freedom of expression).....	15
c. Article 13 (right to an effective remedy).....	15
d. Article 14 (prohibition of discrimination)	16
e. Article 34 (individual applications)	16
f. Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 (protection of property).....	16
g. Article 2 § 1 of Protocol No. 4 (freedom of movement).....	17
II. Private life.....	18
A. Sphere of private life and lack of definition	18
B. Physical, psychological or moral integrity.....	18
a. Victims of violence	19
b. Reproductive rights	20
c. Forced medical treatment and compulsory medical procedures.....	21
d. Mental illness.....	22
e. Health care and treatment	23
f. End of life issues	24
g. Disability issues	25
h. Issues concerning burial	25
i. Environmental issues	26
j. Sexual orientation and sexual life.....	27
k. Professional or business activities	28
C. Privacy.....	29
a. Right to one’s image and photographs; the publishing of photos, images, and Articles.....	30
b. Protection of individual reputation; defamation	31
c. Data protection	33
d. Right to access personal information	35
e. Information about one’s health.....	36

f. File or data gathering by security services or other organs of the State	37
g. Police surveillance.....	38
h. Stop and search police powers.....	39
i. Privacy during detention.....	39
D. Identity and autonomy	39
a. Right to personal development and autonomy.....	40
b. Right to discover one’s origins.....	40
c. Religious and philosophical convictions.....	41
d. Desired appearance.....	41
e. Right to a name/identity documents.....	41
f. Gender identity.....	42
g. Right to ethnic identity	43
h. Statelessness, citizenship and residence	44
i. Marital and parental status	45
III. Family life.....	46
A. Definition of family life and the meaning of family	46
B. Procedural obligation.....	47
C. Margin of appreciation in relation to family life.....	47
D. Sphere of application of family life.....	47
1. Couples.....	47
a. Marriages not according to custom, de facto cohabitation	47
b. Same sex couples.....	48
2. Parents	49
Medically assisted procreation/right to become genetic parents	49
3. Children.....	50
a. Mutual enjoyment	50
b. Ties between natural mother and children	51
c. Ties between natural father and children	51
d. Parental allowances, custody/access, and contact rights	52
e. International child abduction	54
f. Adoption	55
g. Foster families.....	56
h. Parental authority and State care.....	56
4. Other family relationships	58
a. As between siblings, grandparents.....	58
b. Prisoner’s right to contact	58
5. Immigration and expulsion	59
a. Children in detention centres	60
b. Family reunification	60
c. Deportation and expulsion decisions.....	61
d. Residence permits	62
6. Material interests.....	62
IV. Home	62
A. General points	62
1. Scope of the notion of “home”	62
2. Examples of “interference”	64
3. Margin of appreciation	65
B. Housing	65

1. Property owners	66
2. Tenants	66
3. Tenants’ partners/unauthorised occupancy.....	67
4. Minorities and vulnerable persons	67
5. Home visits, searches and seizures.....	68
C. Commercial premises	71
D. Law firms.....	71
E. Journalists’ homes.....	72
F. Home environment	73
1. General approach	73
2. Noise disturbance, problems with neighbours and other nuisances	75
3. Pollutant and potentially dangerous activities	75
V. Correspondence	77
A. General points	77
1. Scope of the concept of “correspondence”	77
2. Positive obligations	78
3. General approach	78
B. Prisoners’ correspondence	79
1. General principles	79
2. Where interference with prisoners’ correspondence may be necessary.....	81
3. Written correspondence.....	82
4. Telephone conversations.....	83
5. Correspondence between prisoners and their lawyer	83
6. Correspondence with the Court	84
7. Correspondence with journalists.....	86
8. Correspondence between a prisoner and a doctor	86
9. Correspondence with close relatives or other individuals	87
10. Correspondence between a prisoner and other addressees	87
C. Lawyers’ correspondence	87
D. Surveillance of telecommunications in a criminal context.....	90
E. Correspondence of private individuals, professionals and companies	91
F. Special secret surveillance of citizens/organisations	92
List of cited cases	98

Note to readers

This Guide is part of the series of Guides on the Convention published by the European Court of Human Rights (hereafter “the Court”, “the European Court” or “the Strasbourg Court”) to inform legal practitioners about the fundamental judgments and decisions delivered by the Strasbourg Court. This particular Guide analyses and sums up the case-law on Article 8 of the European Convention on Human Rights (hereafter “the Convention” or “the European Convention”) until 31 August 2018. Readers will find herein the key principles in this area and the relevant precedents.

The case-law cited has been selected among the leading, major, and/or recent judgments and decisions.*

The Court’s judgments and decisions serve not only to decide those cases brought before it but, more generally, to elucidate, safeguard and develop the rules instituted by the Convention, thereby contributing to the observance by the States of the engagements undertaken by them as Contracting Parties (*Ireland v. the United Kingdom*, § 154, 18 January 1978, Series A no. 25, and, more recently, *Jeronovičs v. Latvia* [GC], no. 44898/10, § 109, ECHR 2016).

The mission of the system set up by the Convention is thus to determine issues of public policy in the general interest, thereby raising the standards of protection of human rights and extending human rights jurisprudence throughout the community of the Convention States (*Konstantin Markin v. Russia* [GC], § 89, no. 30078/06, ECHR 2012). Indeed, the Court has emphasised the Convention’s role as a “constitutional instrument of European public order” in the field of human rights (*Bosphorus Hava Yolları Turizm ve Ticaret Anonim Şirketi v. Ireland* [GC], no. 45036/98, § 156, ECHR 2005-VI).

This Guide contains references to keywords for each cited Article of the Convention and its Additional Protocols. The legal issues dealt with in each case are summarised in a [List of keywords](#), chosen from a thesaurus of terms taken (in most cases) directly from the text of the Convention and its Protocols.

The [HUDOC database](#) of the Court’s case-law enables searches to be made by keyword. Searching with these keywords enables a group of documents with similar legal content to be found (the Court’s reasoning and conclusions in each case are summarised through the keywords). Keywords for individual cases can be found by clicking on the Case Details tag in HUDOC. For further information about the HUDOC database and the keywords, please see the [HUDOC user manual](#).

* The case-law cited may be in either or both of the official languages (English and French) of the Court and the European Commission of Human Rights. Unless otherwise indicated, all references are to a judgment on the merits delivered by a Chamber of the Court. The abbreviation “(dec.)” indicates that the citation is of a decision of the Court and “[GC]” that the case was heard by the Grand Chamber. Chamber judgments that were not final when this update was published are marked with an asterisk (*).

I. The structure of Article 8

Article 8 of the Convention– Right to respect for private and family life

- “1. Everyone has the right to respect for his private and family life, his home and his correspondence.
2. There shall be no interference by a public authority with the exercise of this right except such as is in accordance with the law and is necessary in a democratic society in the interests of national security, public safety or the economic well-being of the country, for the prevention of disorder or crime, for the protection of health or morals, or for the protection of the rights and freedoms of others.”

HUDOC keywords

Expulsion (8) – Extradition (8) – Positive obligations (8)

Respect for private life (8-1) – Respect for family life (8-1) – Respect for home (8-1) – Respect for correspondence (8-1)

Public authority (8-2) – Interference (8-2) – In accordance with the law (8-2) – Accessibility (8-2) – Foreseeability (8-2) – Safeguards against abuse (8-2) – Necessary in a democratic society (8-2) – National security (8-2) – Public safety (8-2) – Economic well-being of the country (8-2) – Prevention of disorder (8-2) – Prevention of crime (8-2) – Protection of health (8-2) – Protection of morals (8-2) – Protection of the rights and freedoms of others (8-2)

1. In order to invoke Article 8, an applicant must show that his or her complaint falls within at least one of the four interests identified in the Article, namely: private life, family life, home and correspondence. Some matters, of course, span more than one interest. First, the Court determines whether the applicant’s claim falls within the scope of Article 8. Next, the Court examines whether there has been an interference with that right or whether the State’s positive obligations to protect the right have been engaged. Conditions upon which a State may interfere with the enjoyment of a protected right are set out in paragraph 2 of Article 8, namely in the interests of national security, public safety or the economic well-being of the country, for the prevention of disorder or crime, for the protection of health or morals, or for the protection of the rights and freedoms of others. Limitations are allowed if they are “in accordance with the law” or “prescribed by law” and are “necessary in a democratic society” for the protection of one of the objectives set out above. In the assessment of the test of necessity in a democratic society, the Court often needs to balance the applicant’s interests protected by Article 8 and a third party’s interests protected by other provisions of the Convention and its Protocols.

A. The scope of Article 8

2. The Court has defined the scope of Article 8 broadly, even when a specific right is not set out in the Article. However, its scope is not limitless. In the case of access to a private beach by a person with disabilities, the Court held that the right asserted concerned interpersonal relations of such broad and indeterminate scope that there could be no conceivable direct link between the measures the State was being urged to take in order to make good the omissions of the private bathing establishments and the applicant’s private life. Accordingly Article 8 was not applicable (*Botta v. Italy*, § 35). Additionally, the Court found that Article 8 was not engaged in a case regarding a conviction for professional misconduct because the offence in question had no obvious bearing on the right to respect for “private life”. On the contrary it concerned professional acts and omissions by public officials in the exercise of their duties. Neither had the applicant pointed to any concrete repercussions on his private life which had been directly and causally linked to his conviction for that specific offence (*Gillberg v. Sweden* [GC], § 70). However, in the case of a police investigator who

had been found guilty of a serious breach of his professional duties for having solicited and accepted bribes in return for discontinuing criminal proceedings and who had wished to practise as a trainee advocate after serving his sentence, the Court found that restrictions on registration as a member of certain professions which could to a certain degree affect that person's ability to develop relationships with the outside world fell within the sphere of his or her private life (*Jankauskas v. Lithuania (no. 2)*, §§ 57-58).

B. Should the case be assessed from the perspective of a negative or positive obligation?

3. The primary purpose of Article 8 is to protect against arbitrary interferences with private and family life, home, and correspondence. This obligation is of the classic negative kind, described by the Court as the essential object of Article 8 (*Kroon and Others v. the Netherlands*, § 31). However, member States also have positive obligations to ensure that Article 8 rights are respected even as between private parties. In particular, although the object of Article 8 is essentially that of protecting the individual against arbitrary interference by the public authorities, it does not merely compel the State to abstain from such interference: in addition to this primarily negative undertaking, there may be positive obligations inherent in an effective respect for private life (*Lozovyye v. Russia*, § 36). These obligations may involve the adoption of measures designed to secure respect for private life even in the sphere of the relations of individuals between themselves (see, for example, *Evans v. the United Kingdom* [GC], § 75, although the principle was first set out in *Marckx v. Belgium*).

4. The principles applicable to assessing a State's positive and negative obligations under the Convention are similar. Regard must be had to the fair balance that has to be struck between the competing interests of the individual and of the community as a whole, the aims in the second paragraph of Article 8 being of a certain relevance (*Hämäläinen v. Finland* [GC], § 65; *Gaskin v. the United Kingdom*, § 42; *Roche v. the United Kingdom* [GC], § 157). Where the case concerns a negative obligation, the Court must assess whether the interference was consistent with the requirements of Article 8 paragraph 2, namely in accordance with the law, in pursuit of a legitimate aim, and necessary in a democratic society. This is analysed in more detail below.

5. In the case of a positive obligation, the Court considers whether the importance of the interest at stake requires the imposition of the positive obligation sought by the applicant. Certain factors have been considered relevant for the assessment of the content of positive obligations on States. Some of them relate to the applicant. They concern the importance of the interests at stake and whether "fundamental values" or "essential aspects" of private life are in issue or the impact on an applicant of a discordance between the social reality and the law, the coherence of the administration and legal practices within the domestic system being regarded as an important factor in the assessment carried out under Article 8. Other factors relate to the impact of the alleged positive obligation at stake on the State concerned. The question is whether the alleged obligation is narrow and precise or broad and indeterminate (*Hämäläinen v. Finland* [GC], § 66).

6. As in the case of negative obligations, in implementing their positive obligations under Article 8, the States enjoy a certain margin of appreciation. A number of factors must be taken into account when determining the breadth of that margin. Where a particularly important facet of an individual's existence or identity is at stake, the margin allowed to the State will be restricted (for example, *X and Y v. the Netherlands*, §§ 24 and 27; *Christine Goodwin v. the United Kingdom* [GC], § 90; *Pretty v. the United Kingdom*, § 71). Where, however, there is no consensus within the Member States of the Council of Europe, either as to the relative importance of the interest at stake or as to the best means of protecting it, particularly where the case raises sensitive moral or ethical issues, the margin will be wider (*X, Y and Z v. the United Kingdom*, § 44; *Fretté v. France*, § 41; *Christine Goodwin v. the United Kingdom* [GC], § 85). There will also often be a wider margin if the State is required to strike a balance between competing private and public interests or Convention rights

(*Fretté v. France*, § 42; *Odièvre v. France* [GC], §§ 44-49; *Evans v. the United Kingdom* [GC], § 77; *Dickson v. the United Kingdom* [GC], § 78; *S.H. and Others v. Austria* [GC], § 94).

7. While the choice of the means to secure compliance with Article 8 in the sphere of protection against acts of individuals is, in principle, within the State’s margin of appreciation, effective deterrence against grave acts (such as rape), where fundamental values and essential aspects of private life are at stake, requires efficient criminal-law provisions. Children and other vulnerable individuals, in particular, are entitled to effective protection (*X and Y v. the Netherlands*, §§ 23-24 and 27; *August v. the United Kingdom* (dec.); *M.C. v. Bulgaria*). Further, the State’s positive obligation under Article 8 to safeguard the individual’s physical integrity may extend to questions relating to the effectiveness of a criminal investigation (*Osman v. the United Kingdom*, § 128; *M.C. v. Bulgaria*, § 150). As such, States have a positive obligation inherent in Articles 3 and 8 of the Convention to enact criminal-law provisions effectively punishing rape and to apply them in practice through effective investigation and prosecution. The State has an obligation to protect a minor against malicious misrepresentation (*K.U. v. Finland*, §§ 45-49). In respect of less serious acts between individuals, which may violate psychological integrity, the obligation of the State under Article 8 to maintain and apply in practice an adequate legal framework affording protection does not always require that an efficient criminal-law provision covering the specific act be in place. The legal framework could also consist of civil-law remedies capable of affording sufficient protection (*ibid.*, § 47; *X and Y v. the Netherlands*, §§ 24 and 27; *Söderman v. Sweden* [GC], § 85). Moreover, as regards the right to health, the member States have a number of positive obligations in this respect under Articles 2 and 8 (*Vasileva v. Bulgaria*, §§ 63-69; *İbrahim Keskin v. Turkey*, § 61).

8. The Court has also articulated the State’s procedural obligations under Article 8, which are particularly relevant in determining the margin of appreciation afforded to the member State. The Court’s analysis includes the following considerations: whenever discretion capable of interfering with the enjoyment of a Convention right is conferred on national authorities, the procedural safeguards available to the individual will be especially material in determining whether the respondent State has, when fixing the regulatory framework, remained within its margin of appreciation. Indeed it is settled case-law that, whilst Article 8 contains no explicit procedural requirements, the decision-making process leading to measures of interference must be fair and such as to afford due respect to the interests safeguarded to the individual by Article 8 (*Buckley v. the United Kingdom*, § 76; *Tanda-Muzinga v. France*, § 68; *M.S. v. Ukraine*, § 70). This requires, in particular, to properly involve the applicant in that process (*Lazoriva v. Ukraine*, § 63).

C. In the case of a negative obligation, was the interference conducted “in accordance with the law”?

9. The Court has repeatedly affirmed that any interference by a public authority with an individual’s right to respect for private life and correspondence must be with in accordance with the law. This expression does not only necessitate compliance with domestic law but also relates to the quality of that law, requiring it to be compatible with the rule of law (*Halford v. the United Kingdom*, § 49).

10. The national law must be clear, foreseeable, and adequately accessible (*Silver and Others v. the United Kingdom*, § 87). This includes sufficient foreseeability that individuals are able to act in accordance with the law, as well as a clear demarcation of the scope of discretion for public authorities. As the Court articulated in the surveillance context, for example, the law must be sufficiently clear in its terms to give citizens an adequate indication of the conditions and circumstances in which the authorities are empowered to resort to any measures of secret surveillance and collection of data (*Shimovolos v. Russia*, § 68). In *Vukota-Bojić v. Switzerland* the Court found a violation of Article 8 due to the lack of clarity and precision in the domestic legal provisions that had served as the legal basis of her surveillance by her insurance company after an accident.

11. The clarity requirement applies to the scope of discretion exercised by public authorities. Domestic law must indicate with reasonable clarity the scope and manner of exercise of the relevant discretion conferred on the public authorities so as to ensure to individuals the minimum degree of protection to which they are entitled under the rule of law in a democratic society (*Piechowicz v. Poland*, § 212). The fact that the applicant's case is the first of its kind under the applicable legislation and that the court has sought guidance from the CJEU on the interpretation of the relevant European law does not render the domestic courts' interpretation and application of the legislation arbitrary or unpredictable (*Satakunnan Markkinapörssi Oy and Satamedia Oy v. Finland* [GC], § 150).

12. With regard to foreseeability, the phrase "in accordance with the law" thus implies, *inter alia*, that domestic law must be sufficiently foreseeable in its terms to give individuals an adequate indication as to the circumstances in which, and the conditions on which, the authorities are entitled to resort to measures affecting their rights under the Convention (*Fernández Martínez v. Spain* [GC], § 117). Foreseeability need not be certain. In *Slivenko v. Latvia* [GC], the applicants must have been able to foresee to a reasonable degree, at least with the advice of legal experts, that they would be regarded as covered by the law (see also *Dubská and Krejzová v. the Czech Republic* [GC], § 171). Absolute certainty in this matter could not be expected (§ 107). It should also be noted that the applicant's profession may be a factor to consider as it provides an indication as to his or her ability to foresee the legal consequences of his or her actions (*Versini-Campinchi and Crasnianski v. France*, § 55).

13. Lawfulness also requires that there be adequate safeguards to ensure that an individual's Article 8 rights are respected. A State's responsibility to protect private and family life often includes positive obligations that ensure adequate regard for Article 8 rights at the national level. The Court, for example, found a violation of the right to private life due to the absence of clear statutory provisions criminalising the act of covertly filming a naked child (*Söderman v. Sweden* [GC], § 117).

14. A finding that the measure in question was not "in accordance with the law" suffices for the Court to hold that there has been a violation of Article 8 of the Convention. It is not therefore necessary to examine whether the interference in question pursued a "legitimate aim" or was "necessary in a democratic society" (*M.M. v. the Netherlands*, § 46).

D. Does the interference further a legitimate aim?

15. Article 8 § 2 enumerates the legitimate aims which may justify an infringement upon the rights protected in Article 8: "in the interests of national security, public safety or the economic well-being of the country, for the prevention of disorder or crime, for the protection of health or morals, or for the protection of the rights and freedoms of others". The Court recently observed that its practice is to be quite succinct when it verifies the existence of a legitimate aim within the meaning of the second paragraphs of Articles 8 to 11 of the Convention (*S.A.S. v. France* [GC], § 114).

16. The Court has found, for example, that immigration measures may be justified by the preservation of the country's economic well-being within the meaning of paragraph 2 of Article 8 rather than the prevention of disorder if the government's purpose was, because of the population density, to regulate the labour market (*Berrehab v. the Netherlands*, § 26). The Court has also found both economic well-being and the protection of the rights and freedom of others to be the legitimate aim of large governments projects, such as the expansion of an airport (*Hatton and Others v. the United Kingdom* [GC], § 121).

17. The Court found that a ban on full-face veils in public places served a legitimate aim taking into account the respondent State's point that the face plays an important role in social interaction. It was therefore able to accept that the barrier raised against others by a veil concealing the face was perceived by the respondent State as breaching the right of others to live in a space of socialisation which makes living together easier (*S.A.S. v. France* [GC], § 122).

18. In *Toma v. Romania*, however, the Court found that the government had provided no legitimate justification for allowing journalists to publish images of a person detained before trial, when there was no public safety reason to do so (§ 92).

E. Is the interference “necessary in a democratic society”?

19. In order to determine whether a particular infringement upon Article 8 is “necessary in a democratic society” the Court balances the interests of the member State against the right of the applicant. In an early and leading Article 8 case, the Court clarified that “necessary” in this context does not have the flexibility of such expressions as “useful”, “reasonable”, or “desirable” but implies the existence of a “pressing social need” for the interference in question. It is for national authorities to make the initial assessment of the pressing social need in each case; accordingly, a margin of appreciation is left to them. However their decision remains subject to review by the Court. A restriction on a Convention right cannot be regarded as “necessary in a democratic society” – two hallmarks of which are tolerance and broadmindedness – unless, amongst other things, it is proportionate to the legitimate aim pursued (*Dudgeon v. the United Kingdom*, §§ 51-53).

20. Subsequently, the Court has affirmed that in determining whether the impugned measures were “necessary in a democratic society”, it will consider whether, in the light of the case as a whole, the reasons adduced to justify them were relevant and sufficient and whether the measures were proportionate to the legitimate aims pursued (*Z v. Finland*, § 94). The Court has further clarified this requirement, stating that the notion of “necessity” for the purposes of Article 8 means that the interference must correspond to a pressing social need, and, in particular, must remain proportionate to the legitimate aim pursued. When determining whether an interference was “necessary” the Court will consider the margin of appreciation left to the State authorities, but it is a duty of the respondent State to demonstrate the existence of a pressing social need behind the interference (*Piechowicz v. Poland*, § 212). The Court reiterated the guiding principles on the margin of appreciation in *Paradiso and Campanelli v. Italy* [GC], §§ 179-184).

21. With regard to general measures taken by the national government, it emerges from the Court’s case-law that, in order to determine the proportionality of a general measure, the Court must primarily assess the legislative choices underlying it. The quality of the parliamentary and judicial review of the necessity of the measure is of particular importance in this respect, as is the risk of abuse if a general measure were to be relaxed, that being a risk which is primarily for the State to assess (*Animal Defenders International v. the United Kingdom* [GC], § 108).

F. Relation between Article 8 and other provisions of the Convention and its Protocols

1. Private and family life

a. Article 2 (right to life) and Article 3 (prohibition of torture)

22. Regarding the protection of the physical and psychological integrity of an individual from the acts of other persons, the Court has held that the authorities’ positive obligations – in some cases under Articles 2 or 3 and in other instances under Article 8 taken alone or in combination with Article 3 of the Convention – may include a duty to maintain and apply in practice an adequate legal framework affording protection against acts of violence by private individuals (see, *inter alia*, *Söderman v. Sweden* [GC], § 80 and the references cited therein).

23. For example, in its case-law on Articles 3 and 8, the Court emphasised the importance to children and the other vulnerable members of society of benefiting from State protection where their physical and mental well-being were threatened (*Wetjen and Others v. Germany*, § 74, and *Tlapak and Others v. Germany*, § 87). In those two cases, the Court reiterated that the fact of regularly

caning one's children was liable to attain the requisite level of severity to fall foul of Article 3 (*Wetjen and Others v. Germany*, § 76; *Tlapak and Others v. Germany*, § 89). Accordingly, in order to prevent any risk of ill-treatment under Article 3, the Court considered it commendable if member States prohibit in law all forms of corporal punishment of children. However, in order to ensure compliance with Article 8, such a prohibition should be implemented by means of proportionate measures so that it was practical and effective and did not remain theoretical (*Wetjen and Others v. Germany*, §§ 77-78; *Tlapak and Others v. Germany*, §§ 90-91).

24. The Court has stated that when a measure falls short of Article 3 treatment, it may, however, fall foul of Article 8 (*Wainwright v. the United Kingdom*, § 43, as regards strip-search). In particular, conditions of detention may give rise to an Article 8 violation where they do not attain the level of severity necessary for a violation of Article 3 (*Raninen v. Finland*, § 63). The Court has frequently found a violation of Article 3 of the Convention on account of poor conditions of detention where the lack of a sufficient divide between the sanitary facilities and the rest of the cell was just one element of those conditions (*Szafrański v. Poland*, §§ 24 and 38). In *Szafrański v. Poland*, the Court found that the domestic authorities failed to discharge their positive obligation of ensuring a minimum level of privacy for the applicant and therefore had violated Article 8 where the applicant had to use the toilet in the presence of other inmates and was thus deprived of a basic level of privacy in his everyday life (§§ 39-41).

25. Similarly, even though the right to health is not a right guaranteed by the Convention and the Protocols thereto, the member States have a number of positive obligations in that connection under Articles 2 and 8. They must, first of all, lay down regulations requiring public and private hospitals to adopt appropriate measures to protect the physical integrity of their patients, and secondly, make available to victims of medical negligence a procedure capable of providing them, if need be, with compensation for damage. Those obligations apply under Article 8 in the event of injury which falls short of threatening the right to life as secured under Article 2 (*Vasileva v. Bulgaria*, §§ 63-69; *Ibrahim Keskin v. Turkey*, § 61).

b. Article 6 (right to a fair trial)

26. The procedural aspect of Article 8 is closely linked to the rights and interests protected by Article 6 of the Convention. Article 6 affords a procedural safeguard, namely the “right to a court” in the determination of one’s “civil rights and obligations”, whereas the procedural requirement of Article 8 does not only cover administrative procedures as well as judicial proceedings, but it is also ancillary to the wider purpose of ensuring proper respect for, *inter alia*, family life (*Tapia Gasca and D. v. Spain*, §§ 111-113; *Bianchi v. Switzerland*, § 112; *McMichael v. the United Kingdom*, § 91; *B. v. the United Kingdom*, §§ 63-65; *Golder v. the United Kingdom*, § 36). The difference between the purpose pursued by the respective safeguards afforded by Articles 6 and 8 may, in the light of the particular circumstances, justify the examination of the same set of facts under both Articles (compare *O. v. the United Kingdom*, §§ 65-67; *Golder v. the United Kingdom*, §§ 41-45; *Macready v. the Czech Republic*, § 41; *Bianchi v. Switzerland*, § 113).

27. The Court is the master of the characterisation to be given in law to the facts of the case and is not bound by the characterisation given by the applicant or the Government (*Soares de Melo v. Portugal*, § 65; *Mitovi v. the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia*, § 49; *Macready v. the Czech Republic*, § 41; *Havelka and Others v. the Czech Republic*, § 35). Thus, the Court will consider under which Article(s) the complaints should be examined (*Radomilja and Others v. Croatia* [GC], § 114).

28. In cases where family life is at stake and the applicants invoke Articles 6 and 8, the Court can decide to examine the facts solely under Article 8. Furthermore, the Court has found that respect for family life requires that future relations between parent and child be determined solely in the light of all relevant considerations and not by the mere passing of time (*Macready v. the Czech Republic*, § 41). According to the Court, the procedural aspect of Article 8 requires the decision-making

process leading to measures of interference to be fair and to afford due respect to the interests safeguarded by the Article (*Soares de Melo v. Portugal*, § 65; *Santos Nunes v. Portugal*, § 56; *Havelka and Others v. the Czech Republic*, §§ 34-35; *Wallová and Walla v. the Czech Republic*, § 47; *Kutzner v. Germany*, § 56; *McMichael v. the United Kingdom*, § 87). Therefore, the Court may also have regard, under Article 8, to the form and length of the decision-making process (*Macready v. the Czech Republic*, § 41) Also, the State has to take all appropriate measures to reunite parents and children (*Santos Nunes v. Portugal*, § 56).

29. For example, whether a case has been heard within a reasonable time – as is required by Article 6 § 1 of the Convention – also forms part of the procedural requirements implicit in Article 8 (*Ribić v. Croatia*, § 92). Also, the Court has examined a complaint about the failure to enforce a decision concerning the applicants' right to have contact only under Article 8 (*Mitovi v. the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia*, § 49). Likewise, the Court decided to examine under Article 8 solely the inactivity and lack of diligence of the State and the excessive length of the proceedings for the execution of the decision to grant the applicant the custody of the child (*Santos Nunes v. Portugal*, §§ 54-56).

30. Moreover, in several cases where a close link was found between the complaints raised under Article 6 and Article 8, the Court has considered the complaint under Article 6 as being part of the complaint under Article 8 (*Anghel v. Italy*, § 69; *Diamante and Pelliccioni v. San Marino*, § 151; *Kutzner v. Germany*, § 57; *Labita v. Italy* [GC], § 187). In *G.B. v. Lithuania*, the Court did not consider it necessary to examine separately whether there had been a violation of Article 6 § 1 given that the Court had found that the applicant's procedural rights had been respected when examining her complaints under Article 8 (§ 113).

31. In *Y. v. Slovenia*, the Court examined whether the domestic trial court struck a proper balance between the protection of the applicant's right to respect for private life and personal integrity and the defence rights of the accused where the applicant had been cross-examined by the accused during criminal proceedings concerning alleged sexual assaults (§§ 114-116).

32. In cases concerning a person's relationship with his or her child there is a duty to exercise exceptional diligence in view of the risk that the passage of time may result in a *de facto* determination of the matter. This duty, which is decisive in assessing whether a case has been heard within a reasonable time as required by Article 6 § 1 of the Convention, also forms part of the procedural requirements implicit in Article 8 (*Süß v. Germany*, § 100; *Strömblad v. Sweden*, § 80; *Ribić v. Croatia*, § 92).

c. Article 9 (freedom of thought, conscience and religion)

33. Although Article 9 governs freedom of thought, conscience, and religious matters, the Court has established that disclosure of information about personal religious and philosophical convictions may engage Article 8 as well, as such convictions concern some of the most intimate aspects of private life (*Folgerø and Others v. Norway* [GC], § 98, where imposing an obligation on parents to disclose detailed information to the school authorities about their religious and philosophical convictions could be seen to constitute a violation of Article 8 of the Convention, even though in the case itself there was no obligation as such for parents to disclose their own convictions).

d. Article 10 (freedom of expression)

34. In cases which require the right to respect for private life to be balanced against the right to freedom of expression, the Court considers that the outcome of the application should not, in theory, vary according to whether it has been lodged with the Court under Article 8 of the Convention by the person who was the subject of the news report, or under Article 10 by the publisher. Indeed, as a matter of principle these rights deserve equal respect (*Couderc and Hachette Filipacchi Associés v. France* [GC], § 91; *Satakunnan Markkinapörssi Oy and Satamedia Oy v. Finland*

[GC], § 123; *Medžlis Islamske Zajednice Brčko and Others v. Bosnia and Herzegovina* [GC], § 77). Accordingly, the margin of appreciation should in theory be the same in both cases. The relevant criteria defined by the case-law are as follows: contribution to a debate of public interest, the degree of notoriety of the person affected, the subject of the news report, the prior conduct of the person concerned, the content, form and consequences of the publication, and, where appropriate, the circumstances in which the photographs were taken (*ibid.*, §§ 90-93; *Von Hannover v. Germany (no. 2)* [GC], §§ 108-113; *Axel Springer AG v. Germany* [GC], §§ 89-95). Furthermore, in the context of an application lodged under Article 10, the Court examines the way in which the information was obtained and its veracity, and the gravity of the penalty imposed on the journalists or publishers (*Satakunnan Markkinapörssi Oy and Satamedia Oy v. Finland* [GC], § 165). Some of these criteria may have more or less relevance given the particular circumstances of the case (see, for a case concerning the mass collection, processing and publication of tax data, *ibid.*, § 166), and according to the context, other criteria may also apply (*Medžlis Islamske Zajednice Brčko and Others v. Bosnia and Herzegovina* [GC], § 88).

35. The Court ruled on the scope of the right to respect for private life safeguarded by Article 8 in relation to the freedom of expression secured by Article 10 to information society service providers such as Google Inc. in *Tamiz v. the United Kingdom* (dec.) and to Internet archives managed by media in *M.L. and W.W. v. Germany*.

e. Article 14 (prohibition of discrimination)

36. On many occasions, Article 8 has been read in conjunction with Article 14.

37. For instance, concerning same-sex couples, the Court has attached importance to the continuing international movement towards the legal recognition of same-sex unions (*Oliari and Others v. Italy*, §§ 178 and 180-185), but leaves open the option for States to restrict access to marriage to different-sex couples (*Schalk and Kopf v. Austria*, § 108).

38. With regard to gender-based discrimination, the Court has noted that the advancement of gender equality is today a major goal for the member States of the Council of Europe and very weighty reasons would have to be put forward before such a difference of treatment could be regarded as compatible with the Convention. In particular, references to traditions, general assumptions or prevailing social attitudes in a particular country are insufficient justification for a difference in treatment on the grounds of sex. For example, in a case concerning the bearing of a woman's maiden name after marriage, the Court found that the importance attached to the principle of non-discrimination prevented States from imposing traditions deriving from the man's primordial role and the woman's secondary role in the family (*Ünal Tekeli v. Turkey*, § 63). The Court has also held that the issue with stereotyping of a certain group in society lies in the fact that it prohibits the individualised evaluation of their capacity and needs (*Carvalho Pinto de Sousa Morais v. Portugal*, § 46 with further references).

39. In *Alexandru Enache v. Romania* the applicant, who had been sentenced to seven years' imprisonment, wanted to look after his child, who was only a few months old. However, his applications to defer his sentence were dismissed by the courts on the grounds that such a measure, which was available to convicted mothers up to their child's first birthday, was to be interpreted strictly and that the applicant, as a man, could not request its application by analogy. The Court found that the applicant could claim to be in a similar situation to that of a female prisoner (§§ 68-69). However, referring to international law, it observed that motherhood enjoyed special protection, and held that the authorities had not breached Article 14 in conjunction with Article 8 (§ 77).

40. Concerning the difference in treatment on the ground of birth out of or within wedlock, the Court has stated that very weighty reasons need to be put forward before such difference in treatment can be regarded as compatible with the Convention (*Sahin v. Germany* [GC], § 94;

Mazurek v. France, § 49; *Camp and Bourimi v. the Netherlands*, §§ 37-38). The same is true for a difference in the treatment of the father of a child born of a relationship where the parties were living together out of wedlock as compared with the father of a child born of a marriage-based relationship (*Sahin v. Germany* [GC], § 94).

41. The Court has found a violation of Article 14 read in conjunction with Article 8 as a result of discriminatory treatment on the part of the authorities' refusal to let a binational couple keep their own surnames after marriage (*Losonci Rose and Rose v. Switzerland*, § 26). A violation was also found as regards a ban on adoption of Russian children by US nationals in *A.H. and Others v. Russia*. Where the State had gone beyond its obligations under Article 8 and created a right to adopt in its domestic law, it could not, in applying that right, take discriminatory measures within the meaning of Article 14. According to the Court, the applicants' right to apply for adoption, and to have their applications considered fairly, fell within the general scope of private life under Article 8.

42. Where withdrawal of parental authority had been based on a distinction essentially deriving from religious considerations, the Court held that there had been a violation of Article 8 in conjunction with Article 14 (*Hoffmann v. Austria*, § 36, concerning the withdrawal of parental rights from the applicant after she divorced the father of their two children because she was a Jehovah's Witness).

2. Home and correspondence

a. Article 2 (right to life)

43. As concerns interferences with the home, the Court established parallels between the State's positive obligations under Article 8 of the Convention, Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 and Article 2 of the Convention (*Kolyadenko and Others v. Russia*, § 216).

b. Article 10 (freedom of expression)

44. Although surveillance or telephone tapping is generally examined under Article 8 alone, such a measure may be so closely linked to an issue falling under Article 10 – for example, if special powers were used to circumvent the protection of a journalistic source – that the Court examines the case under the two Articles concurrently (*Telegraaf Media Nederland Landelijke Media B.V. and Others v. the Netherlands*). In the case cited, the Court found a violation of both Articles. It held that the law had not afforded adequate safeguards in relation to the surveillance of journalists with a view to discovering their sources.

c. Article 13 (right to an effective remedy)

45. In a case concerning home searches, the Court found that the mere possibility of disciplinary proceedings against the police officers who had carried out the searches did not constitute an effective remedy for the purposes of the Convention. In the case of interference with the right to respect for the home, a remedy is effective if the applicant has access to a procedure enabling him or her to contest the lawfulness of searches and seizures and obtain redress where appropriate (*Posevini v. Bulgaria*, § 84).

46. As regards the interception of telephone conversations, in the *İrfan Güzel v. Turkey* judgment (§§ 94-99), after finding that there had been no violation of Article 8 on account of the tapping of the applicant's telephone calls in the course of the criminal proceedings against him, the Court held that there had been a violation of Article 13 in conjunction with Article 8 (see also the references to the *Roman Zakharov v. Russia* [GC] judgment). In the sphere of secret surveillance, where abuses are potentially easy and could have harmful consequences for democratic society as a whole, it is in principle desirable to entrust supervisory control to a judge, judicial oversight offering the best guarantees of independence, impartiality and a proper procedure (*Roman Zakharov v. Russia* [GC],

§ 233; *İrfan Güzel v. Turkey*, § 96). It is advisable to notify the person concerned after the termination of surveillance measures, as soon as notification can be carried out without jeopardising the purpose of the restriction (*Roman Zakharov v. Russia* [GC], §§ 287 et seq.; *İrfan Güzel v. Turkey*, § 98). In order to be able to challenge the decision forming the basis for the interception of communications, the applicant must be provided with a minimum amount of information about the decision, such as the date of its adoption and the authority that issued it (*Roman Zakharov v. Russia* [GC], §§ 291 et seq.; *İrfan Güzel v. Turkey*, § 105). Ultimately, an “effective remedy” for the purposes of Article 13 in the context of secret surveillance must mean “a remedy that is as effective as can be having regard to the restricted scope for recourse inherent in any system of secret surveillance” (*İrfan Güzel v. Turkey*, § 99).

d. Article 14 (prohibition of discrimination)

47. In *Larkos v. Cyprus* [GC] the Court examined the disadvantageous situation of tenants renting State-owned property in relation to tenants renting from private landlords as regards eviction. In *Strunjak and Others v. Croatia* (dec.), it did not find it discriminatory that only tenants occupying State-owned flats had the possibility of purchasing them, whereas tenants of privately owned flats did not. In *Bah v. the United Kingdom* it examined the conditions of access to social housing. In *Karner v. Austria* it considered the issue of the right to succeed to a tenancy within a homosexual couple (see also *Kozak v. Poland* and compare with *Korelc v. Slovenia*, where it was impossible for an individual who had provided daily care to the person he lived with to succeed to the tenancy on the latter’s death). Other cases concern Articles 14 and 8 in conjunction (*Gillow v. the United Kingdom*, §§ 64-67; *Moldovan and Others v. Romania* (no. 2)).

e. Article 34 (individual applications)¹

48. In cases concerning the interception of a letter addressed to or received by the Court, Article 34 of the Convention, which prevents any hindrance of the effective exercise of the right of individual petition, may also be applicable (*Yefimenko v. Russia*, §§ 152-165; *Kornakovs v. Latvia*, § 157; *Chukayev v. Russia*, § 130). As a matter of fact, for the operation of the system of individual petition instituted by Article 34 of the Convention to be effective, applicants or potential applicants must be able to communicate freely with the Court without being subjected to any form of pressure from the authorities to withdraw or modify their application (*Salman v. Turkey* [GC], § 130). Delay by the prison authorities in posting letters to the Court forms an example of hindrance prohibited by the second sentence of Article 34 of the Convention (*Poleshchuk v. Russia*, § 28), as does the authorities’ refusal to send the Court the initial letter from an applicant in detention (*Kornakovs v. Latvia*, §§ 165-167).

f. Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 (protection of property)

49. There may be a significant overlap between the concept of “home” and that of “property” under Article 1 of Protocol No. 1, but the existence of a “home” is not dependent on the existence of a right or interest in respect of real property (*Surugiu v. Romania*, § 63). An individual may have a property right over a particular building or land for the purposes of Article 1 of Protocol No. 1, without having sufficient ties with the property for it to constitute his or her “home” within the meaning of Article 8 (*Khamidov v. Russia*, § 128).

50. In view of the crucial importance of the rights secured under Article 8 to the individual’s identity, self-determination and physical and mental integrity, the margin of appreciation afforded to States in housing matters is narrower in relation to the rights guaranteed by Article 8 than to those protected by Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 (*Gladysheva v. Russia*, § 93). Some measures that constitute

1. See also the chapter on Prisoners’ correspondence.

a violation of Article 8 will not necessarily lead to a finding of a violation of Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 (*Ivanova and Cherkezov v. Bulgaria*, §§ 62-76). The judgment in *Ivanova and Cherkezov v. Bulgaria* highlights the difference between the interests protected by the two Articles and hence the disparity in the extent of the protection they afford, particularly when it comes to applying the proportionality requirements to the facts of a particular case (§ 74).

51. A violation of Article 8 may result from a finding of a violation of Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 (*Doğan and Others v. Turkey* [GC], § 159; *Chiragov and Others v. Armenia* [GC], § 207; *Sargsyan v. Azerbaijan* [GC], §§ 259-260), and the Court may also find a violation of one of the two Articles (*Cyprus v. Turkey* [GC], §§ 175 and 189; *Khamidov v. Russia*, §§ 139 and 146; *Rousk v. Sweden*, §§ 126 and 142; *Kolyadenko and Others v. Russia*, § 217). The Court may also consider it unnecessary to rule separately on one of the two complaints (*Öneryıldız v. Turkey* [GC], § 160; *Surugiu v. Romania*, § 75).

52. Some measures touching on enjoyment of the home should, however, be examined under Article 1 of Protocol No. 1, particularly in standard expropriation cases (*Mehmet Salih and Abdülsamet Çakmak v. Turkey*, § 22; *Mutlu v. Turkey*, § 23).

g. Article 2 § 1 of Protocol No. 4 (freedom of movement)

53. Although there is some interplay between Article 2 § 1 of Protocol No. 4, which guarantees the right to liberty of movement within the territory of a State and freedom to choose one's residence there, and Article 8, the same criteria do not apply in both cases. Article 8 cannot be construed as conferring the right to live in a particular location (*Ward v. the United Kingdom* (dec.); *Codona v. the United Kingdom* (dec.)), whereas Article 2 § 1 of Protocol No. 4 would be devoid of all meaning if it did not in principle require the Contracting States to take account of individual preferences in this sphere (*Garib v. the Netherlands* [GC], §§ 140-141).

II. Private life

A. Sphere of private life and lack of definition

54. Private life is a broad concept incapable of exhaustive definition (*Niemietz v. Germany*, § 29; *Pretty v. the United Kingdom*, § 61; *Peck v. the United Kingdom*, § 57) and may “embrace multiple aspects of the person’s physical and social identity” (*S. and Marper v. the United Kingdom* [GC], § 66). However, through its case-law, the Court has provided guidance as to the meaning and scope of private life for the purposes of Article 8 (*Paradiso and Campanelli v. Italy* [GC], § 159). Moreover, the generous approach to the definition of personal interests has allowed the case-law to develop in line with social and technological developments.

55. In some cases the Court uses both the terms of privacy and correspondence without spelling out precisely which individual interest is at stake (*Klass and Others v. Germany*, § 41; *Kopp v. Switzerland*, § 91).

56. The notion of private life is not limited to an “inner circle” in which the individual may live his own personal life as he chooses and to exclude the outside world. Respect for private life must also comprise to a certain degree the right to establish and develop relationships with other human beings (*Von Hannover v. Germany (no. 2)* [GC], § 95; *Niemietz v. Germany*, § 29; *Botta v. Italy*, § 32) and include professional activities (*Fernández Martínez v. Spain* [GC], § 110; *Bărbulescu v. Romania* [GC], § 71; *Antović and Mirković v. Montenegro*, § 42) or commercial activities (*Satakunnan Markkinapörssi Oy and Satamedia Oy v. Finland* [GC], § 130).

57. Any criminal proceedings entail certain consequences for the private life of an individual who has committed a crime. These are compatible with Article 8 of the Convention provided that they do not exceed the normal and inevitable consequences of such a situation (*Jankauskas v. Lithuania (no. 2)*, §§ 76).

58. Given the very wide range of issues which private life encompasses, cases falling under this notion have been grouped into three broad categories (sometimes overlapping) to provide some means of categorisation, namely: (i) a person’s physical, psychological or moral integrity, (ii) his privacy and (iii) his identity. Sub-groups and examples of cases are given in each category.

B. Physical, psychological or moral integrity

59. The Court indicated for the first time that the concept of private life covered the physical and moral integrity of the person in *X and Y v. the Netherlands*, § 22. That case concerned the sexual assault of a mentally disabled sixteen-year old girl and the absence of criminal law provisions to provide her with effective and practical protection. Regarding the protection of the physical and psychological integrity of an individual from other persons, the Court has held that the authorities’ positive obligations – in some cases under Articles 2 or 3 and in other instances under Article 8 taken alone or in combination with Article 3 of the Convention – may include a duty to maintain and apply in practice an adequate legal framework affording protection against acts of violence by private individuals (*Osman v. the United Kingdom*, §§ 128-130; *Bevacqua and S. v. Bulgaria*, § 65; *Sandra Janković v. Croatia*, § 45; *A v. Croatia*, § 60; *Đorđević v. Croatia*, §§ 141-143; *Söderman v. Sweden* [GC], § 80).

60. The Court has found that Article 8 imposes on States a positive obligation to secure to their citizens the right to effective respect for their physical and psychological integrity (*Nitecki v. Poland* (dec.); *Sentges v. the Netherlands* (dec.); *Odièvre v. France* [GC], § 42; *Glass v. the United Kingdom*, §§ 74-83; *Pentiacova and Others v. Moldova*). In addition, this obligation may involve the adoption of specific measures, including the provision of an effective and accessible means of protecting the right to respect for private life (*Airey v. Ireland*, § 33; *McGinley and Egan v. the United Kingdom*, § 101; *Roche v. the United Kingdom* [GC], § 162). Such measures may include both the provision of a

regulatory framework of adjudicatory and enforcement machinery protecting individuals' rights and the implementation, where appropriate, of these measures in different contexts (*A, B and C v. Ireland* [GC], § 245). For example, in *Hadzhieva v. Bulgaria*, the authorities had arrested the applicant's parents in her presence when she had been fourteen years old, leaving the young applicant to her own devices. Even though the applicable domestic law provided for the adoption of protective measures in such situations, the Court noted that the authorities had failed in their positive obligation to ensure that the applicant was protected and cared for in the absence of her parents, having regard to the risks to her well-being (§§ 62-66).

a. Victims of violence

61. The Court has long held that the State has an affirmative responsibility to protect individuals from violence by third parties. This has been particularly true in cases involving children and victims of domestic violence. While there are often violations of Articles 2 and 3 in such cases, Article 8 is also applied because violence threatens bodily integrity and the right to a private life. In particular, under Article 8 the States have a duty to protect the physical and moral integrity of an individual from other persons. To that end they are to maintain and apply in practice an adequate legal framework affording protection against acts of violence by private individuals (*Sandra Janković v. Croatia*, § 45).

62. In respect of children, who are particularly vulnerable, the measures applied by the State to protect them against acts of violence falling within the scope of Article 8 must also be effective. This should include reasonable steps to prevent ill-treatment of which the authorities had, or ought to have had, knowledge and effective deterrence against such serious breaches of personal integrity (*Z and Others v. the United Kingdom* [GC], § 73; *M.P. and Others v. Bulgaria*, § 108). Such measures must be aimed at ensuring respect for human dignity and protecting the best interests of the child (*Pretty v. the United Kingdom*, § 65; *C.A.S. and C.S. v. Romania*, § 82). In *Wetjen and Others v. Germany*, the Court found that the risk of systematic and regular caning constituted a relevant reason to withdraw parts of the parents' authority and to take the children into care (§ 78) (see also *Tlapak and Others v. Germany*, § 91).

63. Regarding serious acts such as rape and sexual abuse of children, where fundamental values and essential aspects of private life are at stake, it falls to the member States to ensure that efficient criminal law provisions are in place (*X and Y v. the Netherlands*, § 27; *M.C. v. Bulgaria*, § 150, in which the approach taken by the investigator and the prosecutors in the case fell short of the requirements inherent in the States' positive obligations; *M.G.C. v. Romania*, § 74) as well as effective criminal investigations (*C.A.S. and C.S. v. Romania*, § 72; *M.P. and Others v. Bulgaria*, §§ 109-110; *M.C. v. Bulgaria*, § 152; *A, B and C v. Latvia*, § 174) and the possibility to obtain reparation and redress (*C.A.S. and C.S. v. Romania*, § 72). However, there is no absolute right to obtain the prosecution or conviction of any particular person where there were no culpable failures in seeking to hold perpetrators of criminal offences accountable (*Brecknell v. the United Kingdom*, § 64; *Szula v. the United Kingdom* (dec.)).

64. In cases of domestic violence, the Court also holds States responsible for protecting victims, particularly when the risks of violence are known by State officers and when officers fail to enforce measures designed to protect victims of violence (*Bevacqua and S. v. Bulgaria*; *A v. Croatia*; *Hajduová v. Slovakia*; *Kaluczka v. Hungary*; *B. v. Moldova*). The State also has a positive responsibility to protect children from witnessing domestic violence in their homes (*Eremia v. the Republic of Moldova*). The Court will also apply its child custody and care jurisprudence (see below), with particular deference to removal decisions based on patterns of domestic violence in the home (*Y.C. v. the United Kingdom*).

65. In *Y. v. Slovenia*, the Court found that in the criminal proceedings concerning alleged sexual assaults against the applicant, the State did not afford sufficient protection to her right to respect for

private life, and especially for her personal integrity when being cross-examined by the accused (§§ 114-116).

66. States should also provide adequate protection for dangerous situations, such as for a woman attacked in her home or for a woman who had acid thrown on her face (*Sandra Janković v. Croatia*; *Ebcin v. Turkey*). This is particularly true when the State should have known of a particular danger. For example, the Court found a violation when a woman was attacked by stray dogs in an area where such animals were a common problem (*Georgel and Georgeta Stoicescu v. Romania*, § 62).

67. However, the Court does require a connection between the State and the injury suffered. If there is no clear link between State action (or inaction) and the alleged harm, such as fighting between school children, then the Court may declare the case inadmissible (*Đurđević v. Croatia*).

68. Conditions of detention may give rise to an Article 8 violation, in particular where the conditions do not attain the level of severity necessary for a violation of Article 3 (*Raninen v. Finland*, § 63 ; *Szafrański v. Poland*, § 39). Also, the requirement to undergo a strip search will generally constitute an interference under Article 8 (*Milka v. Poland*, § 45).

b. Reproductive rights

69. The Court has found that the prohibition of abortion when sought for reasons of health and/or well-being falls within the scope of the right to respect for one's private life and accordingly within Article 8 (*A, B and C v. Ireland* [GC], §§ 214 and 245). In particular, the Court held in this context that the State's obligations include both the provision of a regulatory framework of adjudication and enforcement machinery protecting individuals' rights, and the implementation, where appropriate, of specific measures (*ibid.*, § 245; *Tysiqc v. Poland*, § 110; *R.R. v. Poland*, § 184). Indeed, once the State, acting within its limits of appreciation, adopts statutory regulations allowing abortion in some situations, the legal framework derived for this purpose should be shaped in a coherent manner which allows the different legitimate interests involved to be taken into account adequately and in accordance with the obligations deriving from the Convention (*A, B and C v. Ireland* [GC], § 249; *R. R. v. Poland*, § 187; *P. and S. v. Poland*, § 99; *Tysiqc v. Poland*, § 116).

70. In *P. and S. v. Poland*, the Court reiterated that the notion of private life within the meaning of Article 8 applies both to decisions to become and not to become a parent (see also *Evans v. the United Kingdom* [GC], § 71; *R.R. v. Poland*, § 180; *Dickson v. the United Kingdom* [GC], § 66; *Paradiso and Campanelli v. Italy* [GC], §§ 163 and 215). In fact, the concept of "private life" does not exclude the emotional bonds created and developed between an adult and a child in situations other than the classic situations of kinship. This type of bond also pertains to individuals' life and social identity. In certain cases involving a relationship between adults and a child where there are no biological or legal ties the facts may nonetheless fall within the scope of "private life" (*Paradiso and Campanelli v. Italy* [GC], § 161).

71. The circumstances of giving birth incontestably form part of one's private life for the purposes of Article 8 (*Ternovszky v. Hungary*, § 22). The Court found in that case that the applicant was in effect not free to choose to give birth at home because of the permanent threat of prosecution faced by health professionals and the absence of specific and comprehensive legislation on the subject. However, national authorities have considerable room for manoeuvre in cases which involve complex matters of health-care policy and allocation of resources. Given that there is currently no consensus among member States of the Council of Europe in favour of allowing home births, a State's policy to make it impossible in practice for mothers to be assisted by a midwife during their home births did not lead to a violation of Article 8 (*Dubská and Krejzová v. the Czech Republic* [GC]).

72. The right of a couple to conceive a child and to make use of medically assisted procreation for that purpose is protected by Article 8, as such a choice is a form of expression of private and family life (*S.H. and Others v. Austria* [GC], § 82; *Knecht v. Romania*, § 54). The same applies for

pre-implantation diagnosis when artificial procreation and termination of pregnancy on medical grounds are allowed (*Costa and Pavan v. Italy*). The latter case concerned an Italian couple who were healthy carriers of cystic fibrosis and wanted, with the help of medically-assisted procreation and genetic screening, to avoid transmitting the disease to their offspring. In finding a violation of Article 8, the Court noted the inconsistency in Italian law that denied the couple access to embryo screening but authorised medically-assisted termination of pregnancy if the foetus showed symptoms of the same disease. The Court concluded that the interference with the applicants' right to respect for their private life and family life had been disproportionate. Where applicants who, acting outside any standard adoption procedure, had brought to Italy from abroad a child who had no biological tie with either parent, and who had been conceived – according to the domestic courts – through assisted reproduction techniques that were unlawful under Italian law, the Court found that there was no family life between the applicants and the child. It considered, however, that the impugned measures pertained to the applicants' private life, but concluded no violation of Article 8 taking into consideration that the public interest at stake weighed heavily in the balance, while comparatively less weight was to be attached to the applicants' interest in their personal development by continuing their relationship with the child (*Paradiso and Campanelli v. Italy* [GC], §§ 165 and 215). The facts of the case touched on ethically sensitive issues – adoption, the taking of a child into care, medically assisted reproduction and surrogate motherhood – in which member States enjoyed a wide margin of appreciation (§§ 182-184 and 194).

73. With regard to prenatal medical tests, the Court found a violation of Article 8 in its procedural aspect where the domestic courts failed to investigate fully the applicant's claim that she had been denied adequate and timely medical care in the form of an antenatal screening test which would have indicated the risk of her foetus having a genetic disorder and would have allowed her to choose whether to continue the pregnancy (*A.K. v. Latvia*, §§ 93-94).

74. Article 8 also applies to sterilisation procedures. As it concerns one of the essential bodily functions of human beings, sterilisation bears on manifold aspects of the individual's personal integrity including his or her physical and mental well-being and emotional, spiritual and family life (*V.C. v. Slovakia*, § 106). The Court has determined that States have a positive obligation to ensure effective legal safeguards to protect women from non-consensual sterilisation, with a particular emphasis on the protection of reproductive health for women of Roma origin. In several cases, the Court has found that Roma women required protection against sterilisation because of a history of non-consensual sterilisation against this vulnerable ethnic minority (*ibid.*, §§ 154-155; *I.G. and Others v. Slovakia*, §§ 143-146). This jurisprudence also applies to inadvertent sterilisation, when the doctor fails to perform adequate checks or obtain informed consent during an abortion procedure (*Csoma v. Romania*, §§ 65-68).

75. The Court also found that the ability of the applicant to exercise a conscious and considered choice regarding the fate of her embryos concerned an intimate aspect of her personal life, of her right to self-determination, and thus of her private life (*Parrillo v. Italy* [GC], § 159). The margin of appreciation of the member States on this matter is wide, given the lack of a European consensus (§§ 180-183). A statutory prohibition on the donation to research of cryopreserved embryos which had been created following the applicant's *in vitro* fertilisation treatment was therefore not considered to be in violation of the applicant's right to private life.

c. Forced medical treatment and compulsory medical procedures

76. The Court has also addressed the implications of Article 8 for other cases involving forced medical treatment or medical injury (in addition to sterilisations). On some occasions, the Convention organs have found that relatively minor medical tests, which are compulsory (*Acmanne and Others v. Belgium*, Commission decision; *Boffa and Others v. San Marino*, Commission decision; *Salveti v. Italy* (dec.)) or authorised by court order (*X v. Austria*, Commission decision; *Peters v. the*

Netherlands, Commission decision), may constitute a proportionate interference with Article 8 even without the consent of the patient.

77. Conversely, the Court has held that a doctor's decision to treat a severely disabled child contrary to a parent's express wishes, and without the opportunity for judicial review of the decision, violated Article 8 (*Glass v. the United Kingdom*). The Court similarly found that doctors taking blood tests and photographs of a child who presented symptoms consistent with abuse without the consent of the child's parents violated the child's right to physical integrity under Article 8 (*M.A.K. and R.K. v. the United Kingdom*). The Court also found that the State's decision to submit a woman in police custody to a non-custodial gynaecological examination was not performed in accordance with the law and violated Article 8 (*Y.F. v. Turkey*, §§ 41-44).

78. The Court further determined that there were Article 8 violations when a State failed to provide adequate information to divers about the health risks associated with decompression tables (*Vilnes and Others v. Norway*, § 244) and when another State failed to provide adequate means of ensuring compensation for injuries caused by State medical errors (*Codarcea v. Romania*). The Court, however, decided that a case against Turkey for failing to compensate individuals who were injured by a non-compulsory vaccine was inadmissible (*Baytüre and Others v. Turkey* (dec.)).

79. In the context of taking evidence in criminal proceedings, taking of a blood and saliva sample against a suspect's will constitutes a compulsory medical procedure which, even if it is of minor importance, must consequently be considered as an interference with his right to privacy (*Jalloh v. Germany* [GC], § 70; *Schmidt v. Germany* (dec.)). The Convention does not, however, as such prohibit recourse to such procedure in order to obtain from him evidence of his involvement in the commission of a criminal offence (*Jalloh v. Germany* [GC], § 70). In *Caruana v. Malta* (dec.), the Court considered that recourse to such medical procedures, particularly when minor, was also not *a priori* prohibited in order to obtain evidence related to the commission of a crime when the subject of the test was not the offender, but a relevant witness (§ 32).

d. Mental illness

80. With regard to the positive obligations that member States have in respect of vulnerable individuals suffering from mental illness, the Court has affirmed that mental health must also be regarded as a crucial part of private life associated with the aspect of moral integrity. The preservation of mental stability is in that context an indispensable precondition to effective enjoyment of the right to respect for private life (*Bensaid v. the United Kingdom*, § 47).

81. The Court has long held that an individual's right to refuse medical treatment falls within the scope of Article 8 (see above). This includes the rights of mentally ill patients to refuse psychiatric medication. A medical intervention in defiance of the subject's will, will give rise to an interference with respect to his or her private life and in particular his or her right to physical integrity (*X. v. Finland*, § 212). In some circumstances forced medication of a mentally ill patient may be justified, in order to protect the patient and for the protection of others. However, such decisions must be made against the background of clear legal guidelines and with the possibility of judicial review (*ibid.*, § 220; *Storck v. Germany*, §§ 164-169; *Shopov v. Bulgaria*, § 47).

82. The Court has also found that States have an obligation under Article 8 to provide protection for a mentally ill person's right to private and family life, particularly when the children of a mentally ill person are taken into State care. States must ensure that mentally ill or disabled individuals are able to participate effectively in proceedings regarding the placement of their children (*B. v. Romania* (no. 2), § 117; *K. and T. v. Finland* [GC]). Such cases are also linked to the Article 8 right to family life (see below), particularly, for example, when a mentally disabled mother was not informed about her son's adoption and was unable to participate in, or to contest, the adoption process (*A.K. and L. v. Croatia*).

83. In cases where States impose legal incapacity on mentally ill individuals, the Court has articulated procedural requirements necessary to protect Article 8 rights. The Court often addresses these Article 8 violations in conjunction with Articles 5 and 6. The Court emphasises the quality of the decision-making procedure (*Salontaji-Drobnjak v. Serbia*, §§ 144-145). The Court has held that the deprivation of legal capacity undeniably constitutes a serious interference with the right to respect for a person’s private life protected under Article 8. A domestic court decision depriving an applicant of his capacity to act independently in almost all areas of his life: at the relevant time he was no longer able to sell or buy any property on his own, work, choose a place of residence, marry, or bring a court action in Lithuania amounted to an interference with right to respect for his private life (*A.N. v. Lithuania*, § 111). In incapacitation proceedings, decisions regarding placement in a secure facility, decisions regarding the disposition of property, and procedures related to children (see above), the Court has held that States must provide adequate safeguards to ensure that mentally disabled individuals are able to participate in the process and that the process is sufficiently individualised to meet their unique needs (*Zehentner v. Austria*, § 65; *Shtukaturov v. Russia*, §§ 94-96; *Herczegfalvy v. Austria*, § 91).

84. As regards the choice of place of residence for a person with intellectual disabilities, the Court has noted the need to reach a fair balance between respect for the dignity and self-determination of the individual and to protect and safeguard his or her interests, especially where the individual’s capacities or situation place him or her in a particularly vulnerable position (*A.-M.V. v. Finland*, § 90). The Court has emphasised the importance of existing procedural safeguards (§§ 82-84). In the case cited it observed that there had been effective safeguards in the domestic proceedings to prevent abuse, as required by the standards of international human rights law. These safeguards had ensured that the applicant’s rights, will and preferences were taken into account. The applicant had been involved at all stages of the proceedings, had been heard in person and had been able to express his wishes. The fact that the authorities had not complied with the applicant’s wishes, in the interests of protecting his health and well-being, was found not to have breached Article 8.

e. Health care and treatment

85. Although the right to health is not as such among the rights guaranteed under the Convention or its Protocols, the High Contracting Parties have, parallel to their positive obligations under Article 2 of the Convention, a positive obligation under its Article 8, firstly, to have in place regulations compelling both public and private hospitals to adopt appropriate measures for the protection of their patients’ physical integrity and, secondly, to provide victims of medical negligence access to proceedings in which they could, in appropriate cases, obtain compensation for damage (*Vasileva v. Bulgaria*, § 63). Those principles emerging from the Court’s Article 2 case-law also apply under Article 8 in the event of injury which falls short of threatening the right to life as secured under Article 2 (*Ibrahim Keskin v. Turkey*, § 61).

86. The Court’s task is to verify the effectiveness of the remedies used by the applicants and thus to determine whether the judicial system ensured the proper implementation of the legislative and statutory framework designed to protect patients’ physical integrity (*Ibrahim Keskin v. Turkey*, § 68). There is a requirement of promptness and reasonable diligence in the context of medical negligence (*Eryiğit v. Turkey*, § 49). For example, proceedings lasting almost seven years are incompatible with Article 8 (*Ibrahim Keskin v. Turkey*, §§ 69-70).

87. The objectivity of expert opinions in cases of medical negligence cannot automatically be called into doubt on account of the fact that the experts are medical practitioners working in the domestic health-care system. Moreover, the very fact that an expert is employed in a public medical institution specially designated to provide expert reports on a particular issue and financed by the State does not in itself justify the fear that such experts will be unable to act neutrally and impartially in providing their expert opinions. What is important in this context is that the

participation of an expert in the proceedings is accompanied by adequate procedural safeguards securing his or her formal and *de facto* independence and impartiality (*Jurica v. Croatia*, § 93).

88. When it comes to access to health services, the Court has been cautious to extend Article 8 in a manner that would implicate extensive State resources because in view of their familiarity with the demands made on the healthcare system as well as with the funds available to meet those demands, the national authorities are in a better position to carry out this assessment than an international court (*Pentiacova and Others v. Moldova* (dec.)).

89. The Court ruled that an application against a decision by UK authorities not to implement a needle-exchange programme for drug users in prisons was inadmissible (*Shelley v. the United Kingdom* (dec.)). In that case the Court held that here was no authority that placed any obligation under Article 8 on a Contracting State to pursue any particular preventive health policy. It also found that there was no violation of Article 8 as a result of Bulgaria’s refusal to allow terminally ill patients to use unauthorised, experimental drugs (*Hristozov and Others v. Bulgaria*; *Durisotto v. Italy* (dec.)) and rejected an application challenging legislation on the prescription of cannabis-based medication (*A.M. and A.K. v. Hungary* (dec.)), while referring to the State’s obligations in this area (§§ 46-47).

90. Regarding access to health care for people with disabilities, the Court declared a case inadmissible in which a severely disabled individual sought a robotic arm to assist his mobility (*Sentges v. the Netherlands* (dec.)). The Court did, however, find that reducing the level of care given to a woman with limited mobility violated Article 8, but only for a limited period during which the UK did not comply with its own laws (*McDonald v. the United Kingdom*).

91. In *Gard and Others v. the United Kingdom* (dec.) the Court rejected the arguments submitted by the parents of a seriously ill child that the question of their son’s treatment was not a matter for the courts to decide, holding on the contrary that it had been appropriate for the treating hospital to turn to the courts in the event of conflict (§ 117).

f. End of life issues

92. In *Pretty v. the United Kingdom*, the Court first concluded that the right to decide the manner of one’s death is an element of private life under Article 8 (§ 67). Later case-law has articulated that an individual’s right to decide the way in which and at which point his or her life should end, provided that he or she is in a position to freely form his or her own judgement and to act accordingly, is one of the aspects of the right to respect for private life within the meaning of Article 8 of the Convention (*Haas v. Switzerland*, § 51).

93. The Court has found that member States have a wide margin of appreciation to treat questions of assisted suicide. Currently there is no consensus among Council of Europe member States in favour of permitting the withdrawal of life-sustaining treatment (*Lambert and Others v. France* [GC], § 148). Permissible laws include the requirement that life-ending drugs be provided only by prescription by a physician (*Haas v. Switzerland*, § 52). Indeed the Court distinguished *Haas v. Switzerland* from *Pretty v. the United Kingdom*. Unlike the *Pretty* case, the Court observed in *Haas v. Switzerland* that the applicant alleged not only that his life was difficult and painful, but also that, if he did not obtain the substance in question, the act of suicide itself would be stripped of dignity. In addition, and again in contrast to the *Pretty* case, the applicant could not in fact be considered infirm, in that he was not at the terminal stage of an incurable degenerative disease which would prevent him from taking his own life.

94. In *Koch v. Germany* the applicant complained that the domestic courts’ refusal to examine the merits of his complaint about the Federal Institute’s refusal to authorise his wife to acquire a lethal dose of pentobarbital of sodium had infringed his right to respect for private and family life under Article 8 of the Convention. The Court found a violation of Article 8 on account of the domestic courts’ refusal to examine the merits of his motion.

95. The Court does not consider it appropriate to extend Article 8 so as to impose on the Contracting States a procedural obligation to make available a remedy requiring the domestic courts to decide on the merits of the claim that the ban on assisted suicide would violate the right to private and family life (*Nicklinson and Lamb v. the United Kingdom* (dec.), § 84).

96. In *Gard and others v. the United Kingdom* (dec.), doctors had sought to withdraw life-sustaining treatment from an infant child suffering from a fatal genetic disease. This decision, taken against the parents' wishes, was not found by the Court to amount to arbitrary or disproportionate interference in breach of Article 8, following a thorough examination of the procedure and the reasons given by the domestic authorities for their decisions (§§ 118-124).

g. Disability issues

97. Regarding a disabled applicant, the Court held that lack of access to public buildings and buildings open to the public affected her life in such a way as to interfere with her right to personal development and her right to establish and develop relationships with other human beings and the outside world and that therefore States might have an obligation to provide access to public buildings. However, the Court ultimately found that the applicant had not demonstrated the existence of a special link between the lack of access to the buildings in question and the particular needs of her private life (*Zehnalova and Zehnal v. the Czech Republic* (dec.); *Botta v. Italy*; *Mółka v. Poland* (dec.)).

98. The Court also found that the decision to remove children from two blind parents due to a finding of inadequate care was not justified by the circumstances and violated the parents' Article 8 right to family life (*Saviny v. Ukraine*). On the other hand, the Court found no violation of Article 8 with regard to a statutory scheme developed in France to compensate parents for the costs of disabled children, even when the parents would have chosen not to have the child in the absence of a mistake by the State hospital regarding the diagnosis of a genetic defect (*Maurice v. France* [GC]; *Draon v. France* [GC]). The Court also provides a wide margin for States to determine the amount of aid given to parents of disabled children (*La Parola and Others v. Italy* (dec.)), and has held that when a State provides adequate domestic remedies for disabilities caused by inadequate care at the birth of a child, then there is no Article 8 violation (*Spyra and Kranczkowski v. Poland*, §§ 99-100).

h. Issues concerning burial

99. The Court has held that the Article 8 protection of private and family life covers the right to bury family members. Individuals have challenged the State's failure to grant access to the remains of deceased family members in a wide range of contexts.

100. The case of *Lozovyye v. Russia*, for instance, concerned a murder victim who had been buried before his parents had been informed of his death. In that case, the Court reiterated that everyone had a right to access to information relating to their private and/or family life (§ 32), and that a person's right to attend the funeral of a member of his family fell under Article 8. Where the authorities, but not other family members, are aware of a death, there is an obligation for the relevant authorities to at least undertake reasonable steps to ensure that members of the family are informed (§ 38). The Court considered that the relevant domestic law and practice lacked clarity, but that that was not sufficient in itself to find a violation of Article 8 (§ 42). On the other hand, it concluded that the authorities had not acted with reasonable diligence to comply with the aforementioned positive obligation, given the information that was available to the domestic authorities in order to identify, locate and inform the deceased's parents (§ 46).

101. In *Hadri-Vionnet v. Switzerland*, the Court found that the municipality's failure to inform the mother about the location and time of the burial of her still-born son was not authorised by law and violated her right to private and family life under Article 8 (*Pannullo and Forte v. France*). Similarly, in *Zorica Jovanović v. Serbia*, the Court held that the hospital's failure to give information to the

applicant regarding the death of her infant son and the subsequent disappearance of his body violated Article 8, even though the child had died in 1983, because of the State’s on-going failure to provide information about what had happened. The Court also held that Russia’s refusal to allow a still-born baby to take the name of its biological father, because of the legal presumption that the mother’s husband was the father, violated the mother’s Article 8 rights to bury her child with the name of his true father (*Znamenskaya v. Russia*).

102. Family members have also challenged the length of time between death and burial and the treatment of the deceased’s body before its return to the family. For example, the Court found that an extended delay in returning samples taken from the applicants’ daughter’s body by police, which prevented them from burying her in a timely manner, violated their Article 8 right to private and family life (*Girard v. France*). The Court also found that a hospital’s removal of a deceased person’s organs without informing his mother and without seeking her consent was not done in accordance with law and violated her right to private life under Article 8 (*Petrova v. Latvia*, §§ 97-98). In line with this case-law, the Court found a violation of Article 8 in the removal of tissue from a deceased person without the knowledge and consent of his spouse because of the lack of clarity in the domestic law and the absence of legal safeguards against arbitrariness (*Elberte v. Latvia*, § 115).

103. However, in *Elli Poluhas Dödsbo v. Sweden*, although the Court acknowledged that the applicant’s Article 8 right to private life was engaged, it found Sweden’s refusal to transfer an urn from one burial plot to another, in order that a deceased person’s remains be located with his family, did not violate Article 8 because the decision was made with due consideration to the interests of the deceased’s wife and fell within the wide margin of appreciation available in such cases. The Court also found that the representative of a deceased person who sought to prevent the State from using DNA of the deceased in a paternity suit did not have a claim that fell within the scope of private life and could not bring a suit on behalf of the deceased (*Estate of Kresten Filtenborg Mortensen v. Denmark* (dec.)).

104. The Court has also addressed a State’s policy of refusing to return the bodies of accused terrorists for burial. While recognising that the State has an interest in protecting public safety, particularly when national security is implicated, the Court found that the absolute ban on returning the bodies of alleged terrorists did not strike a proper balance between the State and the Article 8 rights of the family members of the deceased (*Sabanchiyeva and Others v. Russia*, § 146).

i. Environmental issues

105. Although there is no explicit right to a healthy environment under the Convention (*Hatton and Others v. the United Kingdom* [GC], § 96), the Court has decided various cases in which the quality of an individual’s surrounding environment is at issue, reasoning that an individual’s well-being may be negatively impacted by unsafe or disruptive environmental conditions. Article 8 may apply in environmental cases whether the pollution is directly caused by the State or whether State responsibility arises from the failure to regulate private-sector activities properly. Regard must be had to the fair balance that has to be struck between the competing interests of the individual and of the community as a whole; and in both contexts the State enjoys a certain margin of appreciation in determining the steps to be taken to ensure compliance with the Convention (*Powell and Rayner v. the United Kingdom*; *López Ostra v. Spain*, § 51; *Giacomelli v. Italy*, § 78).

106. In *López Ostra v. Spain*, § 51, the Court ruled that severe environmental pollution could interfere with the right to respect for private and family life (and home)² by potentially affecting individuals’ well-being and preventing them from enjoying their homes, thus adversely affecting their private and family life. The applicant claimed that the family home was subject to serious pollution from a private tannery reprocessing plant built with State subsidies on municipal land 12

2. See also the chapter on Home.

metres from applicant’s flat. In *Giacomelli v. Italy*, §§ 97-98, pollution from a privately owned toxic waste treatment plant 30 metres from the applicant’s home was found to constitute a violation of Article 8, as well as in *Fadeyeva v. Russia*, §§ 133-134, where domestic authorities violated the right to home and private life of a woman by failing to offer her any effective solution to help her move away from a dangerous “sanitary security zone” around Russia’s largest iron smelter in which there was high pollution and dangerous chemical emissions.

107. In several cases, the failure to provide information about environmental risks or hazards was found to constitute a violation of Article 8 (*Tătar v. Romania*, § 97, where authorities failed to carry out an adequate risk assessment of environmental hazards caused by a mining company; *Guerra and Others v. Italy*, where the local population was not provided with essential information that would have enabled them to assess the risks they and their families might run if they continued to live near a chemical factory, right up until the production of fertilisers ceased in 1994).

108. The Court has also found offensive smells from a refuse tip near a prison that reached a prisoner’s cell, regarded as the only “living space” available to him for several years, to fall under the right to private and family life (*Brândușe v. Romania*, §§ 64-67), as well as the prolonged failure by authorities to ensure the collection, treatment and disposal of rubbish (*Di Sarno and Others v. Italy*, § 112).

109. The Court has established that the decision-making process leading to measures of interference must be fair and afford due respect for the interests of the individual as safeguarded by Article 8 (*Taşkın and Others v. Turkey*, § 118, where administrative authorities failed to provide applicants with effective procedural protection concerning the operation of a goldmine site; *Hardy and Maile v. the United Kingdom*, § 217).

110. The Court declared Article 8 applicable where negative environmental conditions resulted from living under the flight paths of Heathrow aircraft because in each case, albeit to greatly differing degrees, the quality of the applicant’s private life and the scope for enjoying the amenities of his home had been adversely affected by the noise generated by aircraft using Heathrow Airport, allowing that environmental claims could, in appropriate circumstances be brought within the ambit of Article 8 (*Powell and Rayner v. the United Kingdom*, § 40). Ultimately, however, the Court concluded that the failure of the government to reduce night flights from Heathrow Airport in the interests of the economic well-being of the country did not breach the Article 8 rights of those living beneath the flight path, taking into account the small number of people afflicted by sleep disturbance (see also *Hatton and Others v. the United Kingdom* [GC], §§ 129-130).

111. In several later noise pollution cases, the Court found that the respondent State had failed to discharge its positive obligation to guarantee the applicant’s right to respect for his or her home and private life. For example, failing to regulate the noise levels of a nightclub near the applicant’s home in Valencia was in breach of Article 8 of the Convention (*Moreno Gómez v. Spain*, §§ 62-63), as was failing to address excessive noise disturbance from heavy traffic on the applicant’s street resulting from traffic changes (*Deés v. Hungary*, § 23), or concerning noise nuisance caused by a computer club in a block of flats (*Mileva and Others v. Bulgaria*, § 97).

j. Sexual orientation and sexual life

112. The Court has held that elements such as gender identification, name and sexual orientation and sexual life are important elements of the personal sphere protected by Article 8 (*B. v. France*, § 63; *Burghartz v. Switzerland*, § 24; *Dudgeon v. the United Kingdom*, § 41; *Laskey, Jaggard and Brown v. the United Kingdom*, § 36; *P.G. and J.H. v. the United Kingdom*). Legislation criminalising sexual acts between consenting homosexuals was found to breach Article 8 (*A.D.T. v. the United Kingdom*, §§ 36-39; *Dudgeon v. the United Kingdom*, § 41). Moreover, the relationship of a same-sex couple falls within the notion of “private life” within the meaning of Article 8 (*Orlandi and Others v. Italy*, § 143). However, Article 8 does not prohibit criminalisation of all private sexual activity, such

as incest (*Stübing v. Germany*), or sadomasochistic sexual activities (*Laskey, Jaggard and Brown v. the United Kingdom*).

113. In a series of cases, the Court held that any ban on the employment of homosexuals in the military constituted a breach of the right to respect for private life as protected by Article 8 (*Lustig-Prean and Beckett v. the United Kingdom*; *Smith and Grady v. the United Kingdom*; *Perkins and R. v. the United Kingdom*; *Beck and Others v. the United Kingdom*).

k. Professional or business activities

114. The notion of “private life” does not exclude, in principle, activities of a professional or business nature (*Jankauskas v. Lithuania (no. 2)*, § 56-57). Indeed, private life encompasses the right for an individual to form and develop relationships with other human beings, including relationships of a professional or business nature (*C. v. Belgium*, § 25; *Oleksandr Volkov v. Ukraine*, § 165). It is, after all, in the course of their working lives that the majority of people have a significant opportunity of developing relationships with the outside world (*Niemietz v. Germany*, § 29; *Bărbulescu v. Romania* [GC], § 71 and references cited therein; *Antović and Mirković v. Montenegro*, § 42).

115. Therefore, restrictions imposed on access to a profession have been found to affect “private life” (*Sidabras and Džiautas v. Lithuania*, § 47; *Bigaeva v. Greece*, §§ 22-25; see also *Jankauskas v. Lithuania (no. 2)*, § 56 and *Lekavičienė v. Lithuania* § 36, concerning restrictions on registration with the Bar Association as a result of a criminal conviction). Likewise, dismissal from office has been found to interfere with the right to respect for private life (*Özpinar v. Turkey*, §§ 43-48). In *Oleksandr Volkov v. Ukraine*, the Court found that such a dismissal for professional fault constituted an interference with his right to respect for “private life” within the meaning of Article 8 (§§ 165-167). The Court found a violation of Article 8 where the applicant was transferred to a less important post in a city which was less important in administrative terms, following a report that he had particular religious beliefs and that his wife wore the Islamic veil (*Sodan v. Turkey*, §§ 57-60). Another violation was found in a case where the applicant was removed from his teaching post following a change affecting the equivalence of his degree obtained abroad (*Şahin Kuş v. Turkey*, §§ 51-52).

116. The Court has also noted that, although an applicant could not prove that there had been interference, in principle, Article 8 extends to private communications made in connection with one’s workplace (*Halford v. the United Kingdom*). In *Fernández Martínez v. Spain* [GC], the Court noted that the interaction between private life *stricto sensu* and professional life was especially striking as the nature of the applicant’s professional activities, and eventual dismissal, directly impacted his conduct in his private life (§ 111).

117. Communications from business premises may be covered by the notions of “private life” and “correspondence” within the meaning of Article 8 (*Bărbulescu v. Romania* [GC], § 73 *Libert v. France*, § 25). In order to ascertain whether those notions are applicable, the Court has on several occasions examined whether individuals had a reasonable expectation that their privacy would be respected and protected. In that context, it has stated that a reasonable expectation of privacy is a significant though not necessarily conclusive factor. Interestingly, in *Bărbulescu v. Romania* [GC], the Court decided to leave open the question of whether the applicant had a reasonable expectation of privacy because, in any event, “an employer’s instructions cannot reduce private social life in the workplace to zero. Respect for private life and for the privacy of correspondence continues to exist, even if these may be restricted in so far as necessary”. Article 8 therefore applied. In sum, whether or not an individual had a reasonable expectation of privacy, communications in the workplace are covered by the concepts of private life and correspondence (§ 80). In this case, the Court set down a

detailed list of factors regarding States' positive obligation under Article 8 of the Convention when it comes to communications of a non-professional nature in the workplace (§§ 121-122)³.

118. In *Antović and Mirković v. Montenegro* the Court emphasised that video surveillance of employees at their workplace, whether covert or not, constituted a considerable intrusion into their private life (§ 44). This case concerned the installation of video surveillance equipment in auditoriums at a university.

C. Privacy

119. As the Court has consistently held, the concept of private life extends to aspects relating to personal identity, such as a person's name, photo, or physical and moral integrity; the guarantee afforded by Article 8 of the Convention is primarily intended to ensure the development, without outside interference, of the personality of each individual in his relations with other human beings. There is thus a zone of interaction of a person with others, even in a public context, which may fall within the scope of private life (*Von Hannover v. Germany (no. 2)* [GC], § 95). Furthermore, the concept of "private life" is a broad term not susceptible to exhaustive definition, which covers the physical and psychological integrity of a person and can therefore embrace multiple aspects of a person's identity, such as gender identification and sexual orientation, name or elements relating to a person's right to their image. It covers personal information which individuals can legitimately expect should not be published without their consent (*Axel Springer AG v. Germany* [GC], § 83).

120. With respect to surveillance and the collection of private data by agents of the State, such information, when systematically collected and stored in a file held by agents of the State, falls within the scope of "private life" for the purposes of Article 8 § 1 of the Convention. That was all the more so in a case where some of the information had been declared false and was likely to injure the applicant's reputation (*Rotaru v. Romania* [GC], § 44). In applying this principle, the Court has explained that there are a number of elements relevant to consideration of whether a person's private life is concerned by measures that take place outside a person's home or private premises. Since there are occasions when people knowingly or intentionally involve themselves in activities which are or may be recorded or reported in a public manner, a person's reasonable expectations as to privacy may be a significant, although not necessarily conclusive, factor (*Benedik v. Slovenia*, § 101). A person who walks down the street will, inevitably, be visible to any member of the public who is also present. Monitoring by technological means of the same public scene (for example, a security guard viewing through closed-circuit television) is of a similar character. Private-life considerations may arise, however, once any systematic or permanent record comes into existence of such material from the public domain. It is for this reason that files gathered by security services on a particular individual fall within the scope of Article 8, even where the information has not been gathered by any intrusive or covert method (*P.G. and J.H. v. the United Kingdom*, § 57).

121. As regards online activities, information associated with specific dynamic IP addresses facilitating the identification of the author of such activities, constitutes, in principle, personal data which are not accessible to the public. The use of such data may therefore fall within the scope of Article 8 (*Benedik v. Slovenia*, §§ 107-108). In that regard, the fact that the applicant had not concealed his dynamic IP address had not been a decisive factor for assessing whether his expectation of privacy had been reasonable (§ 116). Conversely, the anonymity linked to online activities is an important factor which must be taken into account (§ 117).

3. See also the chapter on Correspondence.

a. Right to one's image and photographs; the publishing of photos, images, and Articles

122. Regarding photographs, the Court has stated that a person's image constitutes one of the chief attributes of his or her personality, as it reveals the person's unique characteristics and distinguishes the person from his or her peers. The right to the protection of one's image is thus one of the essential components of personal development. Although freedom of expression includes the publication of photographs, the Court has nonetheless found that the protection of the rights and reputation of others takes on particular importance in this area, as photographs may contain very personal or even intimate information about an individual or his or her family (*Von Hannover v. Germany (no. 2)* [GC], § 103). The Court has articulated the key factors to consider when balancing the right to reputation under Article 8 and freedom of expression under Article 10 as follows: contribution to a debate of general interest; how well known is the person concerned and what is the subject of the report?; prior conduct of the person concerned; content, form and consequences of the publication; circumstances in which the photos were taken; and severity of the sanction imposed (*ibid.*, §§ 108-113; *Axel Springer AG v. Germany* [GC], §§ 89-95; *Couderc and Hachette Filipacchi Associés v. France* [GC], §§ 90-93).

123. Thus, everyone, including people known to the public, has a legitimate expectation that his or her private life will be protected (*Von Hannover v. Germany (no. 2)* [GC], §§ 50-53 and 95-99; *Sciacca v. Italy*, § 29; *Reklos and Davourlis v. Greece*, § 40; *Alkaya v. Turkey*, protecting the private address of a famous actress). However, this is not necessarily a conclusive factor (*Bărbulescu v. Romania* [GC], §§ 73). The Court's case-law mainly presupposes the individual's right to control the use of their image, including the right to refuse publication thereof (*Reklos and Davourlis v. Greece*, §§ 40 and 43, in which photographs of a new-born baby were taken in a private clinic without the parents' prior consent and the negatives retained; *Von Hannover v. Germany (no. 2)* [GC], § 96).

124. The State has positive obligations to ensure that efficient criminal law provisions are in place to prohibit filming without consent, particularly in the case where the victim is a minor and the incident takes place in the home (*Söderman v. Sweden* [GC], § 117, concerning the attempted covert filming of a 14-year old girl by her stepfather while she was naked, and her complaint that the Swedish legal system, which at the time did not prohibit filming without someone's consent, had not protected her against the violation of her personal integrity).

125. The Court has found video surveillance of public places where the visual data are recorded, stored and disclosed to the public to fall under Article 8 (*Peck v. the United Kingdom*, §§ 57-63). In particular, the disclosure to the media for broadcast use of video footage of an applicant whose suicide attempt was caught on surveillance television cameras was found to be a serious interference with the applicant's private life, notwithstanding that he was in a public place at the time (*Ibid.*, § 87).

126. In the case of persons arrested or under criminal prosecution, the Court has held on various occasions that the recording of a video in the law enforcement context or the release of the applicants' photographs by police authorities to the media constituted an interference with their right to respect for private life. The Court has found violations of Article 8 where police made applicants' photographs from the official file available to the press without their consent (*Khuzhin and Others v. Russia*, §§ 115-118; *Sciacca v. Italy*, §§ 29-31; *Khmel v. Russia*, § 40; *Toma v. Romania*, §§ 90-93), and where the posting of an applicant's photograph on the wanted board was not in accordance with domestic law (*Giorgi Nikolaishvili v. Georgia*, §§ 129-131).

127. However, the Court has found that the taking and retention of a photograph of a suspected terrorist without her consent was not disproportionate to the legitimate terrorist-prevention aims of a democratic society (*Murray v. the United Kingdom*, § 93).

128. Article 8 does not necessarily require monetary compensation to the victim if other redress mechanisms are put in place (*Kahn v. Germany*, § 75). In this case, no award of damages was made against the publisher for breaching an injunction not to publish photographs of the two children of a former goalkeeper with the German national football team (see also *Egill Einarsson v. Iceland (no. 2)*, §§ 36-37, and § 39 and the references cited therein).

b. Protection of individual reputation; defamation

129. The right to protection of reputation is protected by Article 8 of the Convention as part of the right to respect for private life (*Axel Springer AG v. Germany* [GC], § 83; *Chauvy and Others v. France*, § 70; *Pfeifer v. Austria*, § 35; *Petrina v. Romania*, § 28; *Polanco Torres and Movilla Polanco v. Spain*, § 40).

130. In order for Article 8 to come into play, an attack on a person’s reputation must attain a certain level of seriousness and in a manner causing prejudice to personal enjoyment of the right to respect for private life (*Axel Springer AG v. Germany* [GC], § 83; *Bédat v. Switzerland* [GC], § 72; *Medžlis Islamske Zajednice Brčko and Others v. Bosnia and Herzegovina* [GC], § 76). There must also be a sufficient link between the applicant and the alleged attack on reputation (*Putistin v. Ukraine*, § 40). The Court did not find a violation of Article 8 in a case concerning an audio-visual recording which was partly broadcast without the applicant’s consent, because among other things, it criticised the commercial practices in a certain industry, rather than the applicant himself (*Haldimann and Others v. Switzerland*, § 52). A television report that described the applicant as a “foreign pedlar of religion” constituted a violation of Article 8 (*Bremner v. Turkey*, §§ 72 and 84).

131. In *Egill Einarsson v. Iceland*, a well-known figure in Iceland had been the subject of an offensive comment on Instagram, an online picture-sharing application, in which he had been called a “rapist” alongside a photograph. The Court held that a comment of this kind was capable of constituting interference with the applicant’s private life in so far as it had attained a certain level of seriousness (§ 52). It pointed out that Article 8 was to be interpreted to mean that even where they had prompted heated debate on account of their behaviour and public comments, public figures should not have to tolerate being publicly accused of violent criminal acts without such statements being supported by facts (§ 52).

132. In the context of the Internet, the Court has emphasised that the test of the level of seriousness is important (*Tamiz v. the United Kingdom* (dec.), §§ 80-81). After all, millions of Internet users post comments online every day and many of these users express themselves in ways that might be regarded as offensive or even defamatory. However, the majority of comments are likely to be too trivial in character, and/or the extent of their publication is likely to be too limited, for them to cause any significant damage to another person’s reputation. In this particular case, the applicant complained that his reputation had been damaged as a result of comments on a blog. In deciding whether that threshold had been met, the Court was inclined to agree with the national courts that while the majority of comments about which the applicant complained were undoubtedly offensive, in large part they were little more than “vulgar abuse” of a kind – albeit belonging to a low register of style – which was common in communication on many Internet portals. Furthermore, many of the comments complained of, which made more specific – and potentially injurious – allegations would, in the context in which they were written, likely be understood by readers as conjecture which should not be taken seriously.

133. Article 8 cannot be relied on in order to complain of a loss of reputation which is the foreseeable consequence of one’s own actions. In *Gillberg v. Sweden* [GC], § 67, the applicant maintained that a criminal conviction in itself affected the enjoyment of his “private life” by prejudicing his honour and reputation. However this line of reasoning was not accepted by the Court (see also, *inter alia*, *Sidabras and Džiautas v. Lithuania*, § 49; *Mikolajová v. Slovakia*, § 57; *Medžlis Islamske Zajednice Brčko and Others v. Bosnia and Herzegovina* [GC], § 76).

134. When examining the necessity of an interference in a democratic society in the interests of the “protection of the reputation or rights of others”, the Court may be required to verify whether the domestic authorities struck a fair balance when protecting two values guaranteed by the Convention which may come into conflict with each other in certain cases, for instance freedom of expression protected by Article 10 and the right to respect for private life enshrined in Article 8 (*Hachette Filipacchi Associés v. France*, § 43; *MGN Limited v. the United Kingdom*, § 142).

135. Although the press must not overstep certain bounds, regarding in particular protection of the reputation and rights of others, its duty is nevertheless to impart – in a manner consistent with its obligations and responsibilities – information and ideas on all matters of public interest, which the public has a right to receive, including reporting and commenting on court proceedings (*Axel Springer AG v. Germany* [GC], § 79). The Court has also stressed the importance of the proactive role of the press, namely to reveal and bring to the public’s attention information capable of eliciting such interest and of giving rise to such a debate within society (*Couderc and Hachette Filipacchi Associés v. France* [GC], § 114). When covering certain events, journalists have the duty to show prudence and caution (*Ibid.*, § 140).

136. When balancing privacy rights under Article 8 with other Convention rights, the Court has found that the State is called upon to guarantee both rights and if the protection of one leads to an interference with the other, to choose adequate means to make this interference proportionate to the aim pursued (*Fernández Martínez v. Spain* [GC], § 123). In this case, the Court found no violation of Article 8 from the refusal to renew the contract of a teacher of Catholic religion and morals after he publicly revealed his position as a “married priest” (§ 89). Conversely, with respect to defamation, the Court found that a failure to adequately investigate the unauthorised disclosure of confidential information or to protect the applicant’s reputation and right to be presumed innocent (a parent suspected of child abuse) violated Article 8 (*Ageyev v. Russia*, § 155).

137. In *Tamiz v. the United Kingdom* (dec.) the Court ruled on the scope of the right to respect for private life safeguarded by Article 8 in relation to the freedom of expression secured by Article 10 to information society service providers such as Google Inc. (§§ 83-84). It found that the State concerned had a wide margin of appreciation and emphasised the important role that such service providers performed on the Internet in facilitating access to information and debate on a wide range of political, social and cultural topics (§ 90). As regards third-party comments on a blog, the Court has emphasised that Article 8 encompasses a positive obligation on the Contracting States to ensure the effective protection of the right to respect for reputation to those within their jurisdiction (*Pihl v. Sweden* (dec.), § 28). In *Egill Einarsson v. Iceland (no. 2)*, the domestic courts declared defamatory statements on Facebook null and void, but, having regard to the circumstances of the case, declined to award the applicant damages or costs. For the Court, the decision not to grant compensation does not in itself amount to a violation of Article 8. Among other factors, the fact that the statements were published as a comment on a Facebook page amongst hundreds or thousands of other comments, and the fact that they had been removed by their author as soon as the applicant had so requested, were taken into account to examine the sufficiency of protection of the applicant’s right to reputation (§§ 38-39).

138. In *Sousa Goucha v. Portugal*, the Court referred to the criterion of “the reasonable reader” when approaching issues relating to satirical material (§ 50; see also *Nikowitz and Verlagsgruppe News GmbH v. Austria*, §§ 24-26). Also, a particularly wide margin of appreciation should be given to parody in the context of freedom of expression (*Sousa Goucha v. Portugal*, § 50). In this case, a well-known celebrity alleged that he had been defamed during a television show shortly after making a public announcement concerning his sexual orientation. The Court considered that, because the joke had not been made in the context of a debate on a matter of public interest (see, *a contrario*, *Alves da Silva v. Portugal* and *Welsh and Silva Canha v. Portugal*), an obligation could arise under Article 8 for the State to protect a person’s reputation where the statement went beyond the limits of what was acceptable under Article 10 (*Sousa Goucha v. Portugal*, § 51). In a case concerning

the non-consensual use of a celebrity’s first name for the purposes of a cigarette advertising campaign, the Court found that the humoristic and commercial nature and his past behaviour outweighed the applicant’s Article 8 arguments (*Bohlen v. Germany*, §§ 58-60; see also *Ernst August von Hannover v. Germany*, § 57).

c. Data protection

139. The storing by a public authority of information relating to an individual’s private life amounts to an interference within the meaning of Article 8, especially where such information concerns a person’s distant past (*Rotaru v. Romania* [GC], §§ 43-44). The subsequent use of the stored information has no bearing on that finding (*Amann v. Switzerland* [GC], §§ 65-67; *Leander v. Sweden*, § 48; *Kopp v. Switzerland*, § 53). In determining whether the personal information retained by the authorities involves any of the private-life aspects, the Court will have due regard to the specific context in which the information at issue has been recorded and retained, the nature of the records, the way in which these records are used and processed and the results that may be obtained (*S. and Marper v. the United Kingdom* [GC], § 67). A DNA profile contains substantial amounts of unique personal data (*Ibid.*, § 75). Banking documents undoubtedly amount to personal data concerning an individual, irrespective of whether or not they contain sensitive information (*M.N. and Others v. San Marino*, § 51). However, the Court will take into account the nature of the information concerned to determine the margin of appreciation of the State (*G.S.B. v. Switzerland*, § 93).

140. The Court has established that Article 8 can be engaged in cases where files or data of a personal or public nature (for example, information about a person’s political activities) are collected and stored by security services or other State authorities (*Rotaru v. Romania* [GC], §§ 43-44; *Association “21 December 1989” and Others v. Romania*, § 115); as well as in regard to entry in a national sex-offenders database (*Gardel v. France*, § 58) and the absence of safeguards for the collection, preservation and deletion of fingerprint records of persons suspected but not convicted of criminal offences (*M.K. v. France*, § 26). The Court also decided that Article 8 was applicable where the State required high-level athletes to provide, at three-monthly intervals, full information on their whereabouts and daily activities, including at weekends, and to update that information, as part of the effort against doping in sport (*National federation of Sportspersons’ Associations and unions (FNASS) and Others v. France*, §§ 155-159).

141. The Court also takes into account the particular context in which information is obtained and stored and the nature of the information. In cases involving suspected terrorists, the Court has found that States enjoy a wider margin of appreciation, especially with regards to storage of information of individuals implicated in past terrorist activities (*Segerstedt-Wiberg and Others v. Sweden*, § 88). The Court has found that it falls within the legitimate bounds of the process of investigation of terrorist crime for the competent authorities to record and retain basic personal details concerning the arrested person or even other persons present at the time and place of arrest (*Murray v. the United Kingdom*, § 93).

142. With regard to the use of modern scientific techniques in the criminal-justice system, the Court has found that the protection afforded by Article 8 of the Convention would be unacceptably weakened if such techniques were allowed at any cost and without carefully balancing the potential benefits of the extensive use of such techniques against important private-life interests (*S. and Marper v. the United Kingdom* [GC], § 112).

143. The indiscriminate and open-ended collection of criminal record data is unlikely to comply with the requirements of Article 8 in the absence of clear and detailed statutory regulations clarifying the safeguards applicable and setting out the rules governing, inter alia, the circumstances in which data can be collected, the duration of their storage, the use to which they can be put and the circumstances in which they may be destroyed (*M.M. v. the United Kingdom*, § 199).

144. The taking of cellular material and its retention, as well as the determination and retention of DNA profiles extracted from cellular samples, constituted an interference with the right to respect for private life within the meaning of Article 8 § 1 of the Convention (*S. and Marper v. the United Kingdom* [GC], §§ 71-77; *Van der Velden v. the Netherlands* (dec.); *W. v. the Netherlands* (dec.)), although this does not necessarily extend to the taking and retention of DNA profiles of convicted criminals for use in possible future criminal proceedings (*Peruzzo and Martens v. Germany* (dec.), §§ 42 and 49). Such interference will be in breach of Article 8 of the Convention unless it can be justified under its paragraph 2 as being “in accordance with the law”, as pursuing one or more of the legitimate aims listed therein, and as being “necessary in a democratic society” in order to achieve the aim or aims concerned (*Peruzzo and Martens v. Germany* (dec.)). In the case of *Aycaguer v. France*, concerning the storage of the DNA profiles of convicted offenders without any difference in duration according to the seriousness of the offence and without any access to a deletion procedure, the Court found a violation (§§ 34, 38, 44 and 45).

145. Spousal testimonial privilege does – unlike in the case of oral evidence – not extend to taking of physical evidence, such as cellular material (*Caruana v. Malta* (dec.), § 35). While the taking of a buccal swab does constitute an interference with the rights under Article 8, it usually causes no bodily injury or any physical or mental suffering, and thus is of minor importance. Thus, in a case where taking of the sample was necessary for investigation of a murder, the Court found the measure in question proportionate (*Ibid.*, § 41).

146. The protection of personal data is of fundamental importance to a person’s enjoyment of his or her right to respect for private and family life as guaranteed by Article 8 of the Convention (*Satakunnan Markkinapörssi Oy and Satamedia Oy v. Finland* [GC], § 133). Thus the use and release of information relating to an individual’s private life which is stored in a secret register comes within the scope of Article 8 § 1 (*Leander v. Sweden*, § 48; *Rotaru v. Romania* [GC], § 46).

147. The domestic law must afford appropriate safeguards to prevent any such use of personal data as may be inconsistent with the guarantees of this Article (*Z v. Finland*, § 95). In line with its findings in *S. and Marper v. the United Kingdom* [GC], § 103, the Court has determined that the need for such safeguards is all the greater where the protection of personal data undergoes automatic processing, not least when such data are used for police purposes. The domestic law should notably ensure that such data are relevant and are efficiently protected from misuse and abuse (*Gardel v. France*, § 62). The Court has nevertheless concluded that entry in a national sex-offenders’ database did not breach Article 8 (*B.B. v. France*, § 60; *Gardel v. France*, § 71; *M.B. v. France*, § 62).

148. The Court found the indefinite retention and disclosure of an applicant’s caution data and the impact of this on her employment prospects to be a violation of Article 8 (*M.M. v. the United Kingdom*, § 207).

149. The Court has found a violation of Article 8 where the applicant’s past employment as a driver for the KGB was publicly disclosed 13 years later (*Sõro v. Estonia*, §§ 56-64). Likewise, lustration proceedings revealing that the applicant had been a collaborator of the secret police of the former regime and that, consequently, he had not fulfilled the additional requirement for public office breached Article 8 (*Ivanovski v. the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia*, § 176). The Court has emphasised that Contracting States which have emerged from non-democratic regimes should be accorded a broad margin of discretion in their choice of how to manage the heritage of such regimes. In the case of *Anchev v. Bulgaria* (dec.), it held that the system of disclosing only the names of persons holding public office who were deemed to have collaborated with the communist regime, as shown by the registers of the former security service, remained within the bounds of the Bulgarian authorities’ margin of appreciation (§§ 103-111, § 113).

150. When it comes to the protection of personal data which are in the public domain, the fact that information is already in the public domain will not necessarily remove the protection of Article 8 (*Satakunnan Markkinapörssi Oy and Satamedia Oy v. Finland* [GC], § 134). Where there has been

compilation of data on a particular individual, processing or use of personal data or publication of the material concerned in a manner or degree beyond that normally foreseeable, private-life considerations arise (§ 136). In this case, the Court found that the data collected, processed and published by newspapers, providing details of the taxable income and taxable assets of a large number of individuals, clearly concerned their private life, notwithstanding the fact that, under domestic law, the public had the possibility of accessing those data, subject to certain rules (§ 138). The domestic law must afford appropriate safeguards to prevent any such use of personal data as may be inconsistent with the guarantees of Article 8. Significantly, the Court noted that Article 8 provided for the right to a form of informational self-determination, allowing individuals to rely on their right to privacy as regards data which, albeit neutral, are collected, processed and disseminated collectively and in such a form or manner that the Article 8 rights of the individuals concerned are engaged (§ 137, see also § 198).

151. *M.L. and W.W. v. Germany** dealt for the first time with the press archives on Internet containing news which has previously been reported (§ 90 and § 102) and the refusal of the applicants' request to oblige media organisations to anonymise on-line archive material concerning their criminal trial and conviction (§ 116). This situation is to be distinguished from cases in which individuals exercise their data protection rights with respect to their personal information which is published on the Internet and which, by means of search engines (§ 91), may be accessed and retrieved by third parties and used for profiling purposes (§ 97).

d. Right to access personal information

152. Matters of relevance to personal development include details of a person's identity as a human being and the vital interest protected by the Convention in obtaining information necessary to discover the truth concerning important aspects of one's personal identity, such as the identity of one's parents, one's origins, and aspects of one's childhood and early development (*Mikulić v. Croatia*, §§ 54 and 64; *Odièvre v. France* [GC], §§ 42 and 44). Birth, and in particular the circumstances in which a child is born, forms part of a child's, and subsequently the adult's, private life guaranteed by Article 8 of the Convention (*Ibid.*, § 29).

153. The Court considers that the interests of the individual seeking access to records relating to her or his private and family life must be secured when a contributor to the records either is not available or improperly refuses consent. Such a system is only in conformity with the principle of proportionality if it provides that an independent authority finally decides whether access has to be granted in cases where a contributor fails to answer or withholds consent (*Gaskin v. the United Kingdom*, § 49; *M.G. v. the United Kingdom*, § 27).

154. The issue of access to information about one's origins and the identity of one's natural parents is not of the same nature as that of access to a case record concerning a child in care or to evidence of alleged paternity (*Odièvre v. France* [GC], § 43).

155. With regard to accessing personal information held by security services, the Court has held that obstacles to access may constitute violations of Article 8 (*Haralambie v. Romania*, § 96; *Joanna Szulc v. Poland*, § 87). However, in cases concerning suspected terrorists, the Court has also held that the interests of national security and the fight against terrorism prevail over the applicants' interest in having access to information about them in the Security Police files (*Segerstedt-Wiberg and Others v. Sweden*, § 91). While the Court has recognised that, particularly in proceedings related to the operations of state security agencies, there may be legitimate grounds to limit access to certain documents and other materials, it has found this consideration loses much of its validity with respect to lustration proceedings (*Turek v. Slovakia*, § 115).

156. The law must provide an effective and accessible procedure enabling applicants to have access to any important information concerning them (*Yonchev v. Bulgaria*, §§ 49-53). In this particular case, the applicant, a police officer, had applied for a position in an international mission, but

following two psychological assessments, had been declared unfit for the position in question. He complained that he had been refused access to his personnel file at the Ministry of the Interior, and in particular the assessments, on the grounds that certain documents were classified.

e. Information about one's health

157. Respecting the confidentiality of health data is a vital principle in the legal systems of all the Contracting Parties to the Convention. It is crucial not only to respect the sense of privacy of a patient, but also to preserve his or her confidence in the medical profession and in the health services in general. Without such protection, those in need of medical assistance may be deterred from revealing such information of a personal and intimate nature as may be necessary in order to receive appropriate treatment and, even, from seeking such assistance. They may thereby endanger their own health and, in the case of transmissible diseases, that of the community. The domestic law must therefore afford appropriate safeguards to prevent any such communication or disclosure of personal health data as may be inconsistent with the guarantees in Article 8 of the Convention (*Z v. Finland*, § 95; *Mockutė v. Lithuania*, §§ 93-94).

158. The right to privacy and other considerations also apply particularly when it comes to protecting the confidentiality of information relating to HIV, as the disclosure of such information can have devastating consequences for the private and family life of the individual and his or her social and professional situation, including exposure to stigma and possible exclusion (*Z v. Finland*, § 96; *C.C. v. Spain*, § 33; *Y v. Turkey* (dec.), § 68). The interest in protecting the confidentiality of such information will therefore weigh heavily in the balance in determining whether the interference was proportionate to the legitimate aim pursued. Such interference cannot be compatible with Article 8 unless it is justified by an overriding requirement in the public interest (*Z v. Finland*, § 96; *Y v. Turkey* (dec.), § 78), in the interest of the applicant himself or in the interest of the safety of hospital staff (*Ibid.*, § 77-78). The disclosure by State hospitals of Jehovah's Witnesses' medical files to the prosecutor's office following their refusal of a blood transfusion constituted an interference with the applicants' right to respect for their private life (*Avilkina and Others v. Russia*, § 54). However, the publication of an article on the mental health status of a psychological expert did not violate Article 8 because of its contribution to a debate of general interest (*Fürst-Pfeifer v. Austria*, § 45).

159. The Court has found that the collection and storage of a person's health-related data for a very long period, together with the disclosure and use of such data for purposes unrelated to the original reasons for their collection, constituted a disproportionate interference with the right to respect for private life (*Surikov v. Ukraine*, §§ 70 and 89, concerning the disclosure to an employer of the medical grounds for an employee's dispensation from military service).

160. The disclosure – without a patient's consent – of medical records, including information relating to an abortion, by a clinic to the Social Insurance Office, and therefore to a wider circle of public servants, constituted an interference with the patient's right to respect for private life (*M.S. v. Sweden*, § 35). The disclosure of medical data by medical institutions to journalists and to a prosecutor's office, and the collection of a patient's medical data by an institution responsible for monitoring the quality of medical care were also held to have constituted an interference with the right to respect for private life (*Mockutė v. Lithuania*, § 95). In this case there had also been an interference with Article 8 concerning the information disclosed to the applicant's mother, given the tense relations between the latter and her daughter (§ 100).

161. The right to effective access to information concerning health and reproductive rights falls within the scope of private and family life within the meaning of Article 8 (*K.H. and Others v. Slovakia*, § 44). There may be positive obligations inherent in effective respect for private or family life which require the State to provide essential information about risks to one's health in a timely manner (*Guerra and Others v. Italy*, §§ 58 and 60). In particular, where a State engages in hazardous activities, which might have hidden adverse consequences on the health of those involved in such

activities, respect for private and family life under Article 8 requires that an effective and accessible procedure be established which enables such persons to seek all relevant and appropriate information (*McGinley and Egan v. the United Kingdom*, §§ 97 and 101; *Roche v. the United Kingdom* [GC], § 167).

f. File or data gathering by security services or other organs of the State⁴

162. The Court has held that where a State institutes secret surveillance, the existence of which remains unknown to the persons being controlled with the effect that the surveillance remains unchallengeable, individuals could be deprived of their Article 8 rights without being aware and without being able to obtain a remedy either at the national level or before the Convention institutions (*Klass and Others v. Germany*, § 36). This is especially so in a climate where technological developments have advanced the means of espionage and surveillance, and where the State may have legitimate interests in preventing disorder, crime, or terrorism (*Ibid.*, § 48). An applicant can claim to be the victim of a violation occasioned by the mere existence of secret surveillance measures or of legislation permitting such measures, if certain conditions are satisfied (*Roman Zakharov v. Russia* [GC], §§ 171-172). In that case, the Court found the *Kennedy* approach was best tailored to the need to ensure that the secrecy of surveillance measures did not result in the measures being effectively unchallengeable and outside the supervision of the national judicial authorities and of the Court (*Kennedy v. the United Kingdom*, § 124; see also *Centrum För Rättvisa v. Sweden**, §§ 90-95).

163. The mere existence of legislation which allows a system for the secret monitoring of communications entails a threat of surveillance for all those to whom the legislation may be applied (*Weber and Saravia v. Germany* (dec.), § 78). While domestic legislatures and national authorities enjoy a certain margin of appreciation in which to assess what might be the best policy in this field, the Contracting States do not enjoy unlimited discretion to subject persons within their jurisdiction to secret surveillance. The Court has affirmed that the Contracting States may not, in the name of the struggle against espionage and terrorism, adopt whatever measures they deem appropriate; rather, whatever system of surveillance is adopted, there must be adequate and effective guarantees against abuse (*Ibid.*, §§ 49-50). Powers of secret surveillance of citizens are tolerable only in so far as strictly necessary for safeguarding the democratic institutions (*ibid.*, § 42; *Rotaru v. Romania* [GC], § 47). Such interference must be supported by relevant and sufficient reasons and must be proportionate to the legitimate aim or aims pursued (*Segerstedt-Wiberg and Others v. Sweden*, § 88).

164. For instance, the Court found the interception and recording of a conversation by a remote radio-transmitting device during a police covert operation without procedural safeguards to be a violation (*Bykov v. Russia* [GC], §§ 81 and 83; *Oleynik v. Russia*, §§ 75-79). Similarly, the systematic collection and storing of data by security services on particular individuals constituted an interference with these persons' private lives, even if such data were collected in a public place (*Peck v. the United Kingdom*, § 59; *P.G. and J.H. v. the United Kingdom*, §§ 57-59) or concerned exclusively the person's professional or public activities (*Amann v. Switzerland* [GC], §§ 65-67; *Rotaru v. Romania* [GC], §§ 43-44). Collection, through a GPS device attached to a person's car, and storage of data concerning that person's whereabouts and movements in the public sphere was also found to constitute an interference with private life (*Uzun v. Germany*, §§ 51-53). Where domestic law does not indicate with sufficient clarity the scope and manner of exercise of the discretion conferred on the domestic authorities to collect and store in a surveillance database information on persons' private lives – in particular, where it does not set out in a form accessible to the public any indication of the minimum safeguards against abuse – this amounts to an interference with private life as

4. See also the chapter on Correspondence (Surveillance of telecommunications in a criminal context and Special secret surveillance of citizens/organisations).

protected by Article 8 § 1 of the Convention (*Shimovolos v. Russia*, § 66, where the applicant’s name was registered in the Surveillance Database which collected information about his movements, by train or air, within Russia). Domestic legislation should provide sufficiently precise, effective and comprehensive safeguards on the ordering, execution and potential redressing of surveillance measures (*Szabó and Vissy v Hungary*). According to that case, the need for the interference to be “necessary in a democratic society” had to be interpreted as requiring that any measures taken should be strictly necessary both, as a general consideration, to safeguard democratic institutions and, as a particular consideration, to obtain essential intelligence in an individual operation. Any measure of secret surveillance which did not fulfil the strict necessity criterion would be prone to abuse by the authorities (§§ 72-73).

165. The Court also found that consultation of a lawyer’s bank statements amounted to an interference with her right to respect for professional confidentiality, which fell within the scope of private life (*Brito Ferrinho Bexiga Villa-Nova v. Portugal*, § 59).

g. Police surveillance⁵

166. The Court has held that the GPS surveillance of a suspected terrorist and the processing and use of the data thus obtained did not violate Article 8 (*Uzun v. Germany*, § 81).

167. However, the Court found a violation of Article 8 where police registered in a secret surveillance security database and tracked the movements of an individual on account of his membership of a human rights organisation (*Shimovolos v. Russia*, § 66, the database in which the applicant’s name had been registered had been created on the basis of a ministerial order, which had not been published and was not accessible to the public. Therefore, the public could not know why individuals were registered in it, what type of information was included and for how long, how it was stored and used or who had control over it).

168. The Court has established that the surveillance of communications and telephone conversations (including calls made from business premises, as well as from the home) is covered by the notion of private life and correspondence under Article 8 (*Halford v. the United Kingdom*, § 44; *Malone v. the United Kingdom*, § 64; *Weber and Saravia v. Germany* (dec.), §§ 76-79). This does not necessarily extend to the use of undercover agents (*Lüdi v. Switzerland*, § 40).

169. Tapping and other forms of interception of telephone conversations represent a serious interference with private life and correspondence and must accordingly be based on a law that is precise. It is essential to have clear, detailed rules on the subject, especially as the technology available for use is continually becoming more sophisticated (*Kruslin v. France*, § 33). When balancing the respondent State’s interest in protecting its national security through secret surveillance measures against the seriousness of the interference with an applicant’s right to respect for his or her private life, the national authorities enjoy a certain margin of appreciation in choosing the means for achieving the legitimate aim of protecting national security. However, there must be adequate and effective safeguards against abuse. The Court thus takes into account the circumstances of the case, such as the nature, scope and duration of the possible measures, the grounds required for ordering them, the authorities competent to authorise, carry out and supervise them, and the kind of remedy provided by the national law (*Roman Zakharov v. Russia* [GC], § 232; *İrfan Güzél v. Turkey*, § 85; see also the recapitulation of the case-law, including on the bulk interception of communications, in *Centrum För Rättvisa v. Sweden*^{*}, §§ 99-110).

170. The Court has found violations of Article 8 where applicants’ telephone conversations in connection with prosecution for criminal offenses were intercepted, “metered”, or listened to in

5. This chapter should be read in conjunction with those on Correspondence (Surveillance of telecommunications in a criminal context and Special secret surveillance of citizens/organisations).

violation of the law (*Malone v. the United Kingdom*; *Khan v. the United Kingdom*). The phrase “in accordance with the law” not only requires compliance with domestic law but also relates to the quality of that law, requiring it to be compatible with the rule of law (*Halford v. the United Kingdom*, § 49). In the context of covert surveillance by public authorities domestic law must provide protection against arbitrary interference with an individual’s right under Article 8 (*Khan v. the United Kingdom*, §§ 26-28). Moreover, the law must be sufficiently clear in its terms to give individuals an adequate indication as to the circumstances in which and the conditions on which public authorities are entitled to resort to such covert measures (*ibid.*). Where there exists no statutory system to regulate the use of covert listening devices, and guidelines concerning them are neither legally binding nor directly publicly accessible, the interference is not “in accordance with the law” as required by Article 8 § 2 of the Convention, and is therefore a violation of Article 8 (*ibid.*, §§ 27-28).

171. The recording of private (telephone) conversations by a conversation partner and the private use of such recordings does not per se offend against Article 8 if this is done by private means. However, this must be distinguished from the covert monitoring and recording of communications by a private person in the context of and for the benefit of an official inquiry – criminal or otherwise – and with the connivance and technical assistance of public investigation authorities (*Van Vondel v. the Netherlands*, § 49). The disclosure of the content of certain conversations to the media obtained through telephone tapping could constitute a violation of Article 8 depending on the circumstances of the case (*Drakšas v. Lithuania*, § 62).

172. The Court considers the surveillance of legal consultations taking place in a police station to be analogous to the interception of a telephone call between a lawyer and client, given the need to ensure an enhanced degree of protection for that relationship and in particular for the confidentiality of the exchanges which characterise it (*R.E. v. the United Kingdom*, § 131).

h. Stop and search police powers

173. The Court has held that there is a zone of interaction between a person with others, even in a public context, which may fall within the scope of “private life” (*Gillan and Quinton v. the United Kingdom*, § 61). The Court has found that the stopping and searching of a person in a public place without reasonable suspicion of wrongdoing is a violation of Article 8 (*ibid.*, § 87).

174. The Court has also found that police officers’ entry into a home in which applicant was not present and there was little or no risk of disorder or crime was disproportionate to the legitimate aim pursued and was therefore a violation of Article 8 (*McLeod v. the United Kingdom*, § 58; *Funke v. France*, § 48).

175. With respect to persons suspected of terrorist-linked offences, governments must strike a fair balance between the exercise by the individual of the right guaranteed to him or her under paragraph 1 of Article 8 and the necessity under paragraph 2 for the State to take effective measures for the prevention of terrorist crimes (*Murray v. the United Kingdom*, §§ 90-91).

i. Privacy during detention

176. In the case of *Szafrański v. Poland*, the Court found that the domestic authorities failed to discharge their positive obligation of ensuring a minimum level of privacy for the applicant and therefore had violated Article 8 where the applicant had to use a toilet in the presence of other inmates and was thus deprived of a basic level of privacy in his everyday life (§§ 39-41).

D. Identity and autonomy

177. Article 8 secures to individuals a sphere within which they can freely pursue the development and fulfilment of their personality (*A.-M.V. v. Finland*, § 76; *Brüggemann and Scheuten v. Germany*,

Commission decision; *National federation of Sportspersons' Associations and unions (FNASS) and Others v. France*, § 153.

a. Right to personal development and autonomy

178. Article 8 protects a right to personal development, and the right to establish and develop relationships with other human beings and the outside world (*Niemietz v. Germany*, § 29; *Pretty v. the United Kingdom*, §§ 61 and 67; *Oleksandr Volkov v. Ukraine*, §§ 165-167; *El Masri v. the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia* [GC], §§ 248-250, concerning the applicant's secret and extrajudicial abduction and arbitrary detention).

179. The right to apply for adoption, and to have their application considered fairly, falls within the scope of "private life" taking into account the couple's decision to become parents (*A.H. and Others v. Russia*, § 383). In *Paradiso and Campanelli v. Italy* [GC] the Court examined a couple's immediate and irreversible separation from a child born abroad under a surrogacy agreement, and its impact on their right to respect for their private life. The Court balanced the general interest at stake against the applicants' interest in ensuring their personal development by continuing their relationship with the child (§ 215). In the case of *Lazoriva v. Ukraine*, the Court held that the applicant's wish to maintain and develop her relationship with her five-year-old nephew by becoming his legal tutor, wish which had an adequate legal and factual basis, was also a matter of private life (§ 66). Consequently, the child's adoption by third persons, which had had the effect of severing the legal ties between the boy and the applicant and to impede her request to take him into her care, amounted to an interference with her right to respect for her private life (§ 68).

180. The right to personal development and personal autonomy does not cover every public activity a person might seek to engage in with other human beings (for example, the hunting of wild animals with hounds in *Friend and Others v. the United Kingdom* (dec.), §§ 40-43). Indeed, not every kind of relationship falls within the sphere of private life. Thus, the right to keep a dog does not fall within the scope of Article 8 protection (*X. v. Iceland*, Commission decision).

b. Right to discover one's origins

181. The Court has recognised the right to obtain information in order to discover one's origins and the identity of one's parents as an integral part of identity protected under the right to private and family life (*Odièvre v. France* [GC], § 42; *Gaskin v. the United Kingdom*, § 39).

182. The Court has ruled that it is not compulsory for States to DNA test alleged fathers, but that the legal system must provide alternative means enabling an independent authority to speedily determine the paternity claim. For example in *Mikulić v. Croatia*, §§ 52-55, the applicant was born out of an extra-marital relationship and complained that the Croatian judicial system had been inefficient in determining the issue of paternity, leaving her uncertain as to her personal identity. In that case the Court held that the inefficiency of the domestic courts had left the applicant in a state of prolonged uncertainty as to her personal identity. The Croatian authorities had therefore failed to secure to the applicant the "respect" for her private life to which she was entitled under the Convention (*Ibid.*, § 68). The Court has also held that procedures must exist that allow particularly vulnerable children, such as those with disabilities, to access information about their paternity (*A.M.M. v. Romania*, §§ 58-65).

183. The Court has held that there is no violation of Article 8 where the State strikes a fair balance between the public interest, a child's personal development and right to know his or her origins, a mother's right to protect her health by giving birth in appropriate medical circumstances, and the protection of other members of the various families involved – especially where the applicant could have requested disclosure of her mother's identity with her consent, could inherit from her adoptive parents and was not in the same position as her mother's other natural children (*Odièvre v. France* [GC], § 29). The applicant, who was adopted, requested access to information to identify her three

biological brothers, but her request was rejected under a special procedure which allowed mothers to remain anonymous; in addition, she could not inherit from her natural mother.

184. However, where national law did not attempt to strike any balance between the competing rights and interests at stake, the inability of a child abandoned at birth to gain access to non-identifying information concerning his or her origins or the disclosure of the mother's identity was a violation of Article 8 (*Godelli v. Italy*, §§ 57-58).

c. Religious and philosophical convictions

185. Although Article 9 governs most freedom of thought, conscience, and religious matters, the Court has established that disclosure of information about personal religious and philosophical convictions may implicate Article 8 as well, as such convictions concern some of the most intimate aspects of private life (*Folgerø and Others v. Norway* [GC], § 98, where imposing an obligation on parents to disclose detailed information to the school authorities about their religious and philosophical convictions could be seen to constitute a violation of Article 8 of the Convention).

d. Desired appearance

186. The Court has established that personal choices as to an individual's desired appearance, whether in public or in private, relate to the expression of his or her personality and thus fall within the notion of private life. It has found to this effect previously as regards a haircut (*Popa v. Romania* (dec.), §§ 32-33), denial of access to a university for wearing a beard (*Tiğ v. Turkey* (dec.)), a ban on wearing clothing designed to conceal the face in public places for women wishing to wear a full-face veil for reasons related to their beliefs (*S.A.S. v. France* [GC], §§ 106-107), and appearing naked in public places (*Gough v. the United Kingdom*, §§ 182-184). However, it is important to note that in each of these cases, the Court found the restriction on personal appearance to be proportionate. The absolute prohibition on growing a beard in prison was considered a violation of Article 8 of the Convention, because that the Government had failed to demonstrate the existence of a pressing social need to justify an absolute prohibition (*Biržietis v. Lithuania*, §§ 54 and 57-58).

e. Right to a name/identity documents

187. The Court has established that issues concerning an individual's first name and surname fall under the right to private life (*Mentzen v. Latvia* (dec.); *Henry Kismoun v. France*). The Court held that as a means of personal identification and of linking to a family, a person's name concerns his or her private and family life, and found a violation of Article 8 where authorities refused to register the applicant's surname after his family surname had been recorded as his wife's surname (*Burghartz v. Switzerland*, § 24).

188. The Court has held that forenames also fall within the ambit of "private life" (*Guillot v. France*, §§ 21-22; *Güzel Erdagöz v. Turkey*, § 43; *Garnaga v. Ukraine*, § 36). However, the Court has found that some laws relating to the registration of names strike a proper balance, while others do not (compare *Guillot v. France*, with *Johansson v. Finland*).

189. The Court has ruled that the tradition of demonstrating family unity by obliging married women to adopt the surname of their husbands is no longer compatible with the Convention (*Ünal Tekeli v. Turkey*, §§ 67-68). The Court has found a violation of Article 14 (prohibition of discrimination) read in conjunction with Article 8 as a result of discriminatory treatment on the part of the authorities' refusal to let a binational couple keep their own surnames after marriage (*Losonci Rose and Rose v. Switzerland*, § 26). The mere fact that a name could take on a negative connotation does not constitute a breach of Article 8 (*Stjerna v. Finland*, § 42; *Siskina and Siskins v. Latvia* (dec.); *Macalin Moxamed Sed Dahir v. Switzerland* (dec.), § 31).

190. As concerns the seizure of documents needed to prove one’s identity, the Court has found an interference with private life as a result of a domestic court’s withholding of identity papers following the applicant’s release from custody, as papers were needed often in everyday life in order to prove one’s identity (*Smirnova v. Russia*, §§ 95-97). The Court has also held, however, that a government may refuse to issue a new passport to a citizen living abroad, if the decision is one made because of public safety, even if the failure to issue a new passport will have negative implications for the applicants’ private and family life (*M. v. Switzerland*, § 67).

f. Gender identity

191. Article 8 is applicable to the question of the legal recognition of the gender identity of transsexuals who have undergone gender reassignment surgery (*Hämäläinen v. Finland* [GC]), the conditions for access to such surgery (*Schlumpf v. Switzerland*; *L. v. Lithuania*; *Y.Y. v. Turkey*) and the legal recognition of the gender identity of transgender persons who have not undergone, or do not wish to undergo, gender reassignment treatment (*A.P., Garçon and Nicot v. France*, §§ 95-96).

192. The Court has dealt with a series of cases concerning the official recognition of transsexuals post gender reassignment surgery in the United Kingdom (*Rees v. the United Kingdom*; *Cossey v. the United Kingdom*; *X, Y and Z v. the United Kingdom*; *Sheffield and Horsham v. the United Kingdom*; *Christine Goodwin v. the United Kingdom* [GC]; *I. v. the United Kingdom* [GC]). In *Christine Goodwin v. the United Kingdom* [GC] and *I. v. the United Kingdom* [GC], the Court found a violation of Article 8 on the basis that European and International consensus favoured the legal recognition of a transsexual’s acquired gender. In the twenty first century the right of transsexuals to personal development and to physical and moral security in the full sense enjoyed by others in society could not be regarded as a matter of controversy requiring the lapse of time to cast clearer light on the issues involved. In short, the unsatisfactory situation in which post-operative transsexuals lived in an intermediate zone as not quite one gender or the other was no longer sustainable (*Christine Goodwin v. the United Kingdom* [GC], § 90; *Grant v. the United Kingdom*, § 40; *L. v. Lithuania*, § 59).

193. An important issue has been access to gender reassignment surgery and other treatments for transgender people. Although the Court has not found a general right to access such treatment, it has found that procedures which deny insurance coverage for such treatment may violate Article 8 (*Schlumpf v. Switzerland*; *Van Kuck v. Germany*). Similarly, the Court found a violation where the absence of a law regulating gender reassignment surgery prevented medical facilities from providing access to such procedures (*L. v. Lithuania*, § 57). It has also ruled on the extent of the margin of appreciation enjoyed by States in recognising a change in gender identity (*A.P., Garçon and Nicot v. France*).

194. In *Y.Y. v. Turkey*, the applicant sought authorisation to undergo gender reassignment surgery. This was refused because the applicant did not satisfy the prior requirement of permanent inability to procreate (§ 44). The Court found that in denying the applicant the possibility of undergoing gender assignment surgery for many years, the State had breached his right to respect for his private life (§§ 121-122).

195. In *A.P., Garçon and Nicot v. France* the Court held that making the recognition of transgender persons’ gender identity conditional on sterilisation surgery or treatment (the sterility requirement) which they did not wish to undergo amounted to making the full exercise of their right to respect for their private life conditional on their relinquishing the full exercise of their right to respect for their physical integrity as protected not only by Article 8 but also by Article 3 of the Convention (§ 131), this being in breach of their right to respect for their private life (§ 135). However, the Court found that, within its wide margin of appreciation, the State could require a prior diagnosis of “gender dysphoria syndrome” (§§ 139-143) and the performance of a medical examination confirming gender reassignment (§§ 150-154).

196. In *Hämäläinen v. Finland* [GC], the applicant complained that the full recognition of her new gender was made conditional on the transformation of her marriage into a registered partnership. The Court noted that the case involved issues which may have had implications for the applicant's family life since under domestic law the conversion of the existing marriage into a registered partnership required the consent of her wife and the fact that the applicant and her wife had a child together. Accordingly Article 8 of the Convention was found to apply under both its private-life and family-life aspects (§§ 60-61).

g. Right to ethnic identity

197. The Court has considered ethnic identity, in particular the right of members of a national minority to maintain their identity and to lead a private and family life in accordance with their tradition, to constitute part of the Article 8 right to private and family life, with a consequent obligation placed upon States to facilitate, and not obstruct disproportionately, the traditional lifestyles of minorities. The Court has found that the authorities' refusal to register an individual's ethnicity as declared by the individual constituted a failure to comply with the State's positive obligation to secure to the applicant the effective respect for his private life (*Ciubotaru v. Moldova*, § 53). The conducting of a meaningful inquiry into the discrimination behind an event that formed part of a general hostile attitude against the Roma community and the implementation of effective criminal-law mechanisms are also considered to be part of the positive obligation of a State to protect respect for ethnic identity (*R.B. v. Hungary*, §§ 88-91).

198. In the specific context of demonstrations motivated by hostility towards an ethnic group, mostly involving intimidation rather than physical violence, the Court drew inspiration from the principles established in cases concerning Article 10 of the Convention. Thus, the key factors to determine are whether the offending statements were made against a tense political and social background, whether they amounted to a direct or indirect call for violence, hatred or intolerance, and their capacity to lead to harmful consequences (*Király and Dömötör v. Hungary*, §§ 72 et seq). A legal framework should be in place for criminalising anti-minority demonstrations and should afford effective protection against harassment, threats and verbal abuse; otherwise, there may be a perception that the authorities tolerate such verbal intimidation and disturbances (§ 80).

199. The occupation by a Gypsy woman of her caravan was found to comprise an integral part of her ethnic identity, one which the State should take into account when instituting measures of forced eviction from the land (*Chapman v. the United Kingdom* [GC], § 73; *McCann v. the United Kingdom*, § 55). The Court also found an Article 8 violation on procedural grounds as a result of a family's summary eviction from the local authority caravan site where the applicant and his family had lived for more than 13 years; the Court stated that such a serious interference necessitated "particularly weighty reasons of public interest" and a narrow margin of appreciation (*Connors v. the United Kingdom*, § 86). However, the Court has in the past found that national planning policies may displace caravan sites if a fair balance is struck between the individual rights of the families living in the site and the environmental (and other) rights of the community (*Jane Smith v. the United Kingdom* [GC], §§ 119-120; *Lee v. the United Kingdom* [GC]; *Beard v. the United Kingdom* [GC]; *Coster v. the United Kingdom* [GC]).

200. The Court has found that the authorities' continued retention of applicants' fingerprints, cellular samples, and DNA profiles after criminal proceedings against them had ended and the usage of those data to infer ethnic origin implicated and violated the applicants' right to ethnic identity under Article 8 (*S. and Marper v. the United Kingdom* [GC], § 66).

201. The Court has also found that any negative stereotyping of a group, when it reaches a certain level, is capable of impacting the group's sense of identity and the feelings of self-worth and self-confidence of members of the group. In this sense it can be seen as affecting the private life of members of the group (*Aksu v. Turkey* [GC], §§ 58-61 where the applicant, who is of Roma origin, felt

offended by certain passages of the book “The Gypsies of Turkey”, which focused on the Roma community; *Király and Dömötör v. Hungary*, § 43, for anti-Roma demonstrations not involving violence but rather verbal intimidation and threats).

202. Finally, the social ties between settled migrants and the community in which they are living, regardless of the existence or otherwise of a family life constitutes part of an individual’s social identity and falls within the meaning of Article 8 (*Üner v. the Netherlands* [GC], § 59).

h. Statelessness, citizenship and residence

203. The right to citizenship has been recognised by the Court, under certain circumstances, as falling under private life (*Genovese v. Malta*). Although the right to acquire a particular nationality is not guaranteed as such by the Convention, the Court has found that an arbitrary refusal of citizenship may, in certain circumstances, raise an issue under Article 8 by impacting on private life (*Karassev v. Finland* (dec.); *Slivenko and Others v. Latvia* (dec.) [GC]; *Genovese v. Malta*). The loss of citizenship that has already been acquired may entail similar – if not greater – interference with the person’s right to respect for his or her private and family life (*Ramadan v. Malta*, § 85; *K2 v. the United Kingdom* (dec.), § 49, in the context of terrorism-related activities). To determine whether such interference breaches Article 8, two separate issues must be addressed: whether the decision to revoke citizenship was arbitrary (a stricter standard than that of proportionality); and what its consequences were for the applicant (*Ramadan v. Malta*, §§ 86-89; *K2 v. the United Kingdom* (dec.), § 50).

204. Article 8 cannot be construed as guaranteeing, as such, the right to a particular type of residence permit; the choice of permit is in principle a matter for the domestic authorities alone (*Kaftailova v. Latvia* (striking out) [GC], § 51). However, the solution proposed must enable the individual in question to exercise unhindered his right to private and/or family life (*B.A.C. v. Greece*, § 35; *Hoti v. Croatia*, § 121). Measures restricting the right to reside in a country may, in certain cases, entail a violation of Article 8 if they create disproportionate repercussions on the private or family life, or both, of the individuals concerned (*Hoti v. Croatia*, § 122).

205. Moreover, in this context, Article 8 may involve a positive obligation to ensure effective enjoyment of the applicant’s private and/or family life (*Hoti v. Croatia*, § 122). In the same case, the national authorities infringed a stateless immigrant’s right to private life by failing, for years, to regularise his resident’s status and leaving him in a situation of insecurity (§ 126). The State had not complied with its positive obligation to provide an effective and accessible procedure or combination of procedures enabling the applicant to have the issues of his further stay and status in Croatia determined with due regard to his private-life interests under Article 8 (§ 141).

206. The Court has also confirmed that the expulsion of settled migrants would amount to an interference with their right to respect for private life. It has held the failure to regulate the residence of persons who had been “erased” from the permanent residents register following Slovenian independence to be a violation of Article 8 (*Kurić and Others v. Slovenia* [GC], § 339).

207. Where there is an arguable claim that expulsion threatens to interfere with a non-citizen’s right to respect for his private and family life, Article 13 in conjunction with Article 8 of the Convention requires that States must make available to the individual concerned the effective possibility of challenging the deportation or refusal of residence order and of having the relevant issues examined with sufficient procedural safeguards and thoroughness by an appropriate domestic forum offering adequate guarantees of independence and impartiality (*De Souza Ribeiro v. France* [GC], § 83; *M. and Others v. Bulgaria*, §§ 122-132; *Al-Nashif v. Bulgaria*, § 133).

i. Marital and parental status

208. The Court has considered cases concerning the marital or parental status of individuals to fall within the ambit of private and family life. In particular, it found that the registration of a marriage, being a recognition of an individual's legal civil status, undoubtedly concerns both private and family life and comes within the scope of Article 8 § 1 (*Dadouch v. Malta*, § 48). An Austrian court's decision to nullify the applicant's marriage had implications for her legal status and in general on her private life. However, since the marriage had been fictitious, the interference with her private life was found to be proportionate (*Benes v. Austria*, Commission decision).

209. Similarly, proceedings relating to one's identity as a parent fall under private and family life. The Court has found cases involving the determination of the legal provisions governing a father's relations with his putative child to come within the scope of private life (*Rasmussen v. Denmark*, § 33; *Yildirim v. Austria* (dec.); *Krušković v. Croatia*, § 20; *Ahrens v. Germany*, § 60; *Tsvetelin Petkov v. Bulgaria*, §§ 49-59; *Marinis v. Greece*, § 58), as does a putative father's attempt to disavow paternity (*R.L. and Others v. Denmark*, § 38; *Shofman v. Russia*, §§ 30-32). In addition, the right to apply for adoption with a view to becoming parents falls within the scope of private life (*A.H. and Others v. Russia*, § 383).

III. Family life

A. Definition of family life and the meaning of family

210. The essential ingredient of family life is the right to live together so that family relationships may develop normally (*Marckx v. Belgium*, § 31) and members of the family may enjoy each other's company (*Olsson v. Sweden (no. 1)*, § 59). The notion of family life is an autonomous concept (*Marckx v. Belgium*, § 31). Consequently, whether or not "family life" exists is essentially a question of fact depending upon the real existence in practice of close personal ties (*Paradiso and Campanelli v. Italy* [GC], § 140). The Court will therefore look at *de facto* family ties, such as applicants living together, in the absence of any legal recognition of family life (*Johnston and Others v. Ireland*, § 56). Other factors will include the length of the relationship and, in the case of couples, whether they have demonstrated their commitment to each other by having children together (*X, Y and Z v. the United Kingdom*, § 36). In *Ahrens v. Germany*, § 59, the Court found no *de facto* family life where the relationship between the mother and the applicant had ended approximately one year before the child was conceived and the ensuing relations were of a sexual nature only. The conformity of the applicants' conduct with the law is also a factor to be considered (*Paradiso and Campanelli v. Italy* [GC], § 156).

211. A child born of a marital relationship is *ipso jure* part of that "family" unit from the moment and by the very fact of his or her birth (*Berrehab v. the Netherlands*, § 21). Thus, there exists between the child and its parents a bond amounting to family life. The existence or non-existence of "family life" within the meaning of Article 8 is a question of fact depending upon the real existence in practice of close personal ties, for instance the demonstrable interest and commitment by the father to the child both before and after birth (*L. v. the Netherlands*, § 36).

212. Where the existence of a family tie with a child has been established, the State must act in a manner calculated to enable that tie to be developed and legal safeguards must be established that render possible as from the moment of birth, or as soon as practicable thereafter, the child's integration in his family (*Kroon and Others v. the Netherlands*, § 32).

213. In spite of the absence of a biological tie and of a parental relationship legally recognised by the respondent State, the Court found that there existed family life between the foster parents who had cared for a child on a temporary basis and the child in question, on account of the close personal ties between them, the role played by the adults vis-à-vis the child, and the time spent together (*Moretti and Benedetti v. Italy*, § 48; *Kopf and Liberda v. Austria*, § 37). In addition, in the case of *Wagner and J.M.W.L. v. Luxembourg* – which concerned the inability to obtain legal recognition in Luxembourg of a Peruvian judicial decision pronouncing the second applicant's full adoption by the first applicant – the Court recognised the existence of family life in the absence of legal recognition of the adoption. It took into consideration that *de facto* family ties had existed for more than ten years between the applicants and that the first applicant had acted as the minor child's mother in every respect. In these cases, the child's placement with the applicants was respectively recognised or tolerated by the authorities. On the contrary, in *Paradiso and Campanelli v. Italy* [GC], having regard to the absence of any biological tie between the child and the intended parents, the short duration of the relationship with the child (about eight months) and the uncertainty of the ties from a legal perspective, and in spite of the existence of a parental project and the quality of the emotional bonds, the Court considered that the conditions enabling it to conclude that there had existed a *de facto* family life had not been met (§§ 156-157) (compare and contrast *D. and Others v. Belgium* (dec.)).

214. Article 8 does not guarantee either the right to found a family or the right to adopt. The right to respect for "family life" does not safeguard the mere desire to found a family; it presupposes the existence of a family, or at the very least the potential relationship between, for example, a child born out of wedlock and his or her natural father, or the relationship that arises from a genuine

marriage, even if family life has not yet been fully established, or the relationship between a father and his legitimate child even if it proves, years later, to have had no biological basis (*Paradiso and Campanelli v. Italy* [GC], § 141). An applicant’s intention to develop a previously non-existent “family life” with her nephew by becoming his legal tutor lies outside the scope of “family life” as protected by Article 8 (*Lazoriva v. Ukraine*, § 65).

215. However, where family life is not found, Article 8 may still be applicable under its private life head (*Paradiso and Campanelli v. Italy* [GC], § 165; *Lazoriva v. Ukraine*, §§ 61 and 66).

B. Procedural obligation

216. Whilst Article 8 contains no explicit procedural requirements (as noted above), the decision-making process involved in measures of interference must be fair and sufficient to afford due respect to the interests safeguarded by Article 8, in particular in relation to children being taken into care (*W. v. the United Kingdom*, §§ 62 and 64; *McMichael v. the United Kingdom*, § 92; *T.P. and K.M. v. the United Kingdom* [GC], §§ 72-73). Also, the Court has stated that in cases in which the length of proceedings has a clear impact on the applicant’s family life, a more rigorous approach is called for, and the remedy available in domestic law should be both preventive and compensatory (*Macready v. the Czech Republic*, § 48; *Kuppinger v. Germany*, § 137).

C. Margin of appreciation in relation to family life

217. A number of factors must be taken into account when determining the width of the margin of appreciation to be enjoyed by the State when deciding any case under Article 8. The Court recognises that the authorities enjoy a wide margin of appreciation, in particular when assessing the necessity of taking a child into care by way of an emergency order (*R.K. and A.K. v. the United Kingdom*) or when framing their divorce laws and implementing them in specific cases (*Babiarz v. Poland*, § 47) or in respect of the determination of a child’s legal status (*Fröhlich v. Germany**, § 41).

218. The margin of appreciation is more limited regarding questions of contact and information rights (*Fröhlich v. Germany**). And much narrower when it comes to prolonged separation of a parent and child. In such cases, States have an obligation to take measures to reunite parents and children (*Elsholz v. Germany* [GC]; *K.A. v. Finland*).

D. Sphere of application of family life

1. Couples

a. Marriages not according to custom, *de facto* cohabitation

219. The notion of “family” under Article 8 of the Convention is not confined solely to marriage-based relationships and may encompass other *de facto* “family ties” where the parties are living together outside marriage (i.e. out of wedlock) (*Johnston and Others v. Ireland*, § 56; *Van der Heijden v. the Netherlands* [GC], § 50, which dealt with the attempt to compel the applicant to give evidence in criminal proceedings against her long term co-habiting partner). Even in the absence of cohabitation there may still be sufficient ties for family life (*Kroon and Others v. the Netherlands*, § 30) as the existence of a stable union may be independent of cohabitation (*Vallianatos and Others v. Greece* [GC], §§ 49 and 73). However, that does not mean that *de facto* families and relationships have to be granted specific legal recognition (*Babiarz v. Poland*, § 54): thus, the State’s positive obligations do not include an obligation to accept a petition for divorce filed by an applicant wishing to remarry after having an child with his new partner (§§ 56-57). Moreover, while nowadays cohabitation might not be a defining criterion for establishing the stability of a long-lasting relationship, it certainly is a factor which could help rebut other indications which raise doubts about

the sincerity of a marriage (*Concetta Schembri v. Malta* (dec.), § 52 concerning a marriage that was considered not genuine).

220. The Court has further considered that intended family life may exceptionally fall within the ambit of Article 8, notably in cases where the fact that family life has not yet fully been established is not attributable to the applicant (*Pini and Others v. Romania*, §§ 143 and 146). In particular, where the circumstances warrant it, family life must extend to the potential relationship which may develop between a child born out of wedlock and the biological father. Relevant factors which may determine the real existence in practice of close personal ties in these cases include the nature of the relationship between the natural parents and a demonstrable interest in and commitment by the father to the child both before and after the birth (*Nylund v. Finland* (dec.); *L. v. the Netherlands*, § 36; *Anayo v. Germany*, § 57).

221. In general, however, cohabitation is not a *sine qua non* of family life between parents and children (*Berrehab v. the Netherlands*, § 21). Marriages which are not in accordance with national law are not a bar to family life (*Abdulaziz, Cabales and Balkandali v. the United Kingdom*, § 63). A couple who enters into a purely religious marriage not recognised by domestic law may come within the scope of family life within the meaning of Article 8. However, Article 8 cannot be interpreted as imposing an obligation on the State to recognise religious marriage, for example in relation to inheritance rights and survivors' pensions (*Şerife Yiğit v. Turkey* [GC], §§ 97-98 and 102) or where the marriage was contracted by a 14-year-old child (*Z.H. and R.H. v. Switzerland*, § 44).

222. Finally, engagement does not in itself create family life (*Wakefield v. the United Kingdom*, Commission decision).

b. Same sex couples

223. A same-sex couple living in a stable relationship fall within the notion of family life, as well as private life, in the same way as a heterosexual couple (*Vallianatos and Others v. Greece* [GC], § 73-74; *X and Others v. Austria* [GC], § 95; *P.B. and J.S. v. Austria*, § 30; *Schalk and Kopf v. Austria*, §§ 92-94). This principle was first set out in the case of *Schalk and Kopf v. Austria* where the Court considered it artificial to maintain the view that, in contrast to a different-sex couple, a same-sex couple could not enjoy “family life” for the purposes of Article 8. Consequently, the relationship of the applicants, a cohabiting same-sex couple living in a stable de facto partnership, fell within the notion of “family life”, just as the relationship of a different-sex couple in the same situation would. The Court has also established that the relationship between two women who were living together and had entered into a civil partnership, and the child conceived by one of them by means of assisted reproduction but being brought up by both of them, constituted family life within the meaning of Article 8 (*Gas and Dubois v. France* (dec.); *X and Others v. Austria* [GC], § 96).

224. In 2010, the Court has noted that there is an emerging European consensus towards legal recognition of same-sex couples, which has developed rapidly over the past decade (*Schalk and Kopf v. Austria*, § 105; see also *Orlandi and Others v. Italy*, §§ 204-206). In the cases of *Schalk and Kopf v. Austria*, § 108, and *Chapin and Charpentier v. France*, § 48, the Court found that States were free, under Article 14 taken in conjunction with Article 8, to restrict access to marriage to different-sex couples.

225. However, the Court has found a violation of Article 14 taken together with Article 8 where a law barred same-sex couples from entering into civil unions, noting that of the 19 State parties to the Convention which authorised some form of registered partnership other than marriage, only two states reserved it exclusively to different-sex couples (*Vallianatos and Others v. Greece* [GC], §§ 91-92). Noting the continuing international movement towards legal recognition and taking into account the specific circumstances in Italy, the Court found that the Italian authorities had failed to comply with the positive obligation under Article 8 to ensure that the applicants have available a specific legal framework providing for the recognition and protection of their same-sex unions (*Oliari*

and Others v. Italy, §§ 178 and 180-185). The Court noted that within the Council of Europe, twenty-four of the forty-seven member States had already enacted legislation recognising same-sex couples and affording them legal protection (§ 178). It observed that in Italy there was a conflict between the social reality of the applicants, who lived openly as a couple, and their inability to secure any official recognition of their relationship. Noting that guaranteeing the recognition and protection of same-sex unions would not amount to any particular burden on the Italian State, it held that in the absence of marriage, same-sex couples like the applicants had a particular interest in obtaining the option of entering into a form of civil union or registered partnership, since this would be the most appropriate way in which they could have their relationship legally recognised and be guaranteed the relevant protection – in the form of core rights relevant to a couple in a stable and committed relationship – without unnecessary hindrance (§ 173-174).

226. As to the refusal to register same-sex marriages contracted abroad, in *Orlandi and Others v. Italy* the national authorities failed to provide any form of protection to the applicants' same-sex union, as a result of the legal vacuum which existed in Italian law (in so far as it did not provide for any union capable of safeguarding the applicants' relationship). The failure to ensure that the applicants had available a specific legal framework providing for the recognition and protection of their same-sex unions breached Article 8 (§ 201).

227. In two cases, the Court considered same-sex couples to be in a different situation than heterosexual couples. In *Aldeguer Tomás v. Spain*, the Court found no violation of Article 14 read in conjunction with Article 8 of the Convention and Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 where the surviving partner of a same-sex couple, contrary to the surviving partner of a heterosexual couple, could not obtain a survivor's pension where the other partner had died before the recognition of same-sex marriage in 2005 (§§ 88-90). In *Taddeuci and McCall v. Italy*, the Court found a violation of Article 14 of the Convention read in conjunction with Article 8 where a same-sex couple was prevented from living together in Italy as a result of the refusal to grant one applicant, a non-EU national, a residence permit for family purposes (§§ 98-99). The Court considered that a same-sex couple where one of the partners was a non-EU national was in a different situation than an unmarried heterosexual couple where one of the partners was a non-EU national and, therefore, needed to be treated differently (§ 85).

228. In another case concerning the regulation of residence permits for family reunification, however, the Court considered same-sex and different sex couples as being in a similar position (*Pajić v. Croatia*, § 73). The Court stated that by tacitly excluding same-sex couples from its scope, the domestic legislation introduced a difference in treatment based on sexual orientation and thus violated Article 8 of the Convention (§§ 79-84).

229. In a case where the applicant sought to have her identity number changed from a male to a female one after having undergone gender reassignment surgery, family life was implicated by the fact that full recognition of her new gender required the transformation of her marriage into a registered partnership (*Hämäläinen v. Finland* [GC], §§ 60-61). However, the Court found that the conversion of the applicant's marriage into a registered partnership would not constitute a violation of family life under Article 8 (*Ibid.*, § 86).

2. Parents

Medically assisted procreation/right to become genetic parents

230. Like the notion of private life (see "Reproductive rights" above), the notion of family life incorporates the right to respect for decisions to become a parent in the genetic sense (*Dickson v. the United Kingdom* [GC], § 66; *Evans v. the United Kingdom* [GC], § 72). Accordingly, the right of a couple to make use of medically assisted procreation comes within the ambit of Article 8, as an expression of private and family life (*S.H. and Others v. Austria* [GC], § 82). However, the provisions

of Article 8 taken alone do not guarantee either the right to found a family or the right to adopt (*E.B. v. France* [GC], § 41).

231. The Court considers that concerns based on moral considerations or on social acceptability must be taken seriously in a sensitive domain like artificial procreation (*S. H. and Others v. Austria* [GC], § 100). However, they are not in themselves sufficient reasons for a complete ban on a specific artificial procreation techniques such as ovum donation; notwithstanding the wide margin of appreciation afforded to the Contracting States, the legal framework devised for this purpose must be shaped in a coherent manner which allows the different legitimate interests involved to be adequately taken into account (*ibid.*).

232. The Court found no violation of Article 8 where domestic law permitted the applicant’s former partner to withdraw his consent to the storage and use by her of embryos created jointly by them, preventing her from ever having a child to whom she would be genetically related (*Evans v. the United Kingdom* [GC], § 82).

233. Article 8 also protects children born to a surrogate mother outside the member State in question, whose legal mother according to the foreign State could not register as a legal mother under French law. However, the Court does not require that States legalise surrogacy and, furthermore, States may demand proof of parentage for children born to surrogates before issuing the child’s identity papers (*Mennesson v. France; Labassee v. France; D. and Others v. Belgium; Foulon and Bouvet v. France*, §§ 55-58).

234. *Paradiso and Campanelli v. Italy* [GC] concerned the separation and placement for adoption of a child conceived abroad through surrogacy and brought back to Italy in violation of Italian adoption laws (§ 215). The Court found that no family life had existed in this particular case and considered it under the notion of “private life”.

3. Children

a. Mutual enjoyment

235. The mutual enjoyment by parent and child of each other’s company constitutes a fundamental element of family life within the meaning of Article 8 of the Convention (even if the relationship between the parents has broken down), and domestic measures hindering such enjoyment amount to an interference with the right protected by Article 8 of the Convention (*Monory v. Romania and Hungary*, § 70; *Zorica Jovanović v. Serbia*, § 68; *Kutzner v. Germany*, § 58; *Elsholz v. Germany* [GC], § 43; *K. and T. v. Finland* [GC], § 151).

236. The Court has found that an applicant’s secret and extrajudicial abduction and arbitrary detention resulted in the deprivation of mutual enjoyment between family members and was therefore a violation of Article 8 (*El-Masri v. the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia* [GC], §§ 248-250). The Court has also found a violation of Article 8 where the applicant was kept in isolation for more than a year, separated from his family, who did not have any information on his situation (*Nasr and Ghali v. Italy*, § 305).

237. The Court has also found that a State’s continuing failure to provide an applicant with credible information as to the fate of her son constituted a continuing violation of the right to mutual enjoyment and respect for her family life (*Zorica Jovanović v. Serbia*, §§ 74-75).

238. A refusal to allow a child to accompany her mother to another country for the purposes of the latter’s postgraduate education based on the absence of the consent of both parents needs to be examined in the light of the child’s best interest, avoiding a formalistic and mechanical approach (*Penchevi v. Bulgaria*, § 75).

b. Ties between natural mother and children

239. A natural mother’s standing suffices to afford her the necessary power to apply to the Court on her child’s behalf too, in order to protect his or her interests (*M.D. and Others v. Malta*, § 27).

240. The Court regards a single woman and her child as one form of family no less than others. In acting in a manner calculated to allow the family life of an unmarried mother and her child to develop normally, the State must avoid any discrimination on grounds of birth (*Marckx v. Belgium*, §§ 31 and 34). The development of the family life of an unmarried mother and her child whom she has recognised may be hindered if the child does not become a member of the mother’s family and if the establishment of affiliation has effects only as between the two of them (*ibid.*, § 45; *Kearns v. France*, § 72).

241. A natural parent who knowingly gives consent to adoption may later be legally prevented from rescinding that waiver (*I.S. v. Germany*), but a parent must have the legal capacity to make such a waiver. Where there is insufficient legislation to protect parental rights, then an adoption decision violates the mother’s right to family life (*Zhou v. Italy*). Similarly, where a child was unjustifiably taken into care and separated from her mother and the local authority failed to submit the issue to the court for determination, the natural mother was deprived of an adequate involvement in the decision-making process concerning the care of her daughter and thereby of the requisite protection of their interests, resulting in a failure to respect family life (*T.P. and K.M. v. the United Kingdom* [GC], § 83).

c. Ties between natural father and children

242. The Court observes that the notion of family life in Article 8 is not confined solely to marriage-based relationships and may encompass other *de facto* “family” ties where the parties are living together outside marriage (*Keegan v. Ireland*, § 44; *Kroon and Others v. the Netherlands*, § 30). The application of this principle has been found to extend equally to the relationship between natural fathers and their children born out of wedlock. Further, the Court considers that Article 8 cannot be interpreted as only protecting family life which has already been established but, where the circumstances warrant it, must extend to the potential relationship which may develop between a natural father and a child born out of wedlock (*Nylund v. Finland* (dec.); *Shavdarov v. Bulgaria*, § 40). In the latter case, the Court accepted that the presumption of paternity meant that the applicant was not able to establish paternal affiliation by law, but that he could have taken other steps to establish a parental link, hence finding no violation of Article 8.

243. Where the existence or non-existence of family life concerns a potential relationship which could develop between a child born out of wedlock and its natural father, relevant factors include the nature of the relationship between the natural parents and the demonstrable interest in and commitment by the father to the child both before and after its birth (*Nylund v. Finland* (dec.)). Mere biological kinship, without any further legal or factual elements indicating the existence of a close personal relationship, is not sufficient to attract the protection of Article 8 (*L. v. the Netherlands*, §§ 37-40). On the other hand, the complete and automatic exclusion of the applicant from his child’s life after the termination of his paternity, without properly considering the child’s best interests, amounted to a failure to respect the applicant’s family life (*Nazarenko v. Russia*, §§ 65-66; compare *Mandet v. France*, § 58). The Court has also found a violation of Article 8 where the applicants were unable to establish their paternity due to a strict statute of limitations (*Călin and Others v. Romania*, §§ 96-99).

244. In *Shofman v. Russia*, concerning a father’s decision to bring an action contesting paternity once he had discovered that he was not the biological father of a child born two years previously, the Court found that the introduction of a time-limit for the institution of paternity proceedings could be justified by the desire to ensure legal certainty in family relations and to protect the interests of the child (§ 39). However, it held that it was not necessarily proportionate to set a time-

limit of one year from the child’s birth with no exceptions permitted, especially where the person concerned had not been aware of the biological reality (§ 43) (see also *Paulík v. Slovakia*, §§ 45-47).

245. In the case of children born outside marriage who wish to bring an action for recognition of paternity before the domestic courts, the existence of a limitation period *per se* is not incompatible with the Convention (*Phinikaridou v. Cyprus*, §§ 51-52). Nevertheless, States must strike a fair balance between the competing rights and interests at stake (§§ 53-54). The application of a rigid time-limit for instituting paternity proceedings, regardless of the circumstances of an individual case and, in particular, the knowledge of the facts concerning paternity, impairs the very essence of the right to respect for private life under Article 8 (§ 65).

246. A situation in which a legal presumption is allowed to prevail over biological and social reality, without regard to both established facts and the wishes of those concerned and without actually benefiting anyone, is not compatible, even having regard to the margin of appreciation left to the State, with the obligation to secure effective “respect” for private and family life (*Kroon and Others v. the Netherlands*, § 40).

247. There exists between the child and his or her parents a bond amounting to family life even if at the time of his or her birth the parents are no longer co-habiting or if their relationship has then ended (*Berrehab v. the Netherlands*, § 21). Where the relationship between the applicant and the child’s mother had lasted for two years, during one of which they co-habited and planned to get married, and the conception of their child was the result of a deliberate decision, it followed that from the moment of the child’s birth there existed between the applicant and his daughter a bond amounting to family life, regardless of the status of the relationship between the applicant and the child’s mother (*Keegan v. Ireland*, §§ 42-45). Thus, permitting the applicant’s child to have been placed for adoption shortly after the child’s birth without the father’s knowledge or consent constituted an Article 8 violation (*Ibid.*, § 55).

248. The Court found that the domestic courts did not exceed their wide margin of appreciation when they took into account the applicant’s refusal to abide by a court-ordered genetic testing and declared him the father of the child, giving priority to the latter’s right to respect for private life over that of the applicant (*Canonne v. France* (dec.), § 34 and § 30 for DNA tests). The Court found no violation of Article 8 in a case involving the refusal, in the best interests of the children concerned, to recognise their biological father (*R.L. and Others v. Denmark*). The Court observed that the domestic courts had taken account of the various interests at stake and prioritised what they believed to be the best interests of the children, in particular their interest in maintaining the family unit. (§§ 47-48). In *Fröhlich v. Germany**, the Court accepted the importance the question of paternity might have for the child in the future, when it would start to ask about her origin, but held that at that time it was not in the best interest of the six-year-old child to be confronted with the paternity issue. As a result, a courts’ refusal to grant contact rights or order legal parents to provide information about child’s personal circumstances to potential biological father did not breach Article 8 (§§ 62-64).

d. Parental allowances, custody/access, and contact rights

249. The Court has stated that while Article 8 does not include a right to parental leave or impose any positive obligation on States to provide parental leave allowances, at the same time, by enabling one of the parents to stay at home to look after the children, parental leave and related allowances promote family life and necessarily affect the way in which it is organised; thus, parental leave and parental allowances come within the scope of Article 8 (*Konstantin Markin v. Russia* [GC], § 130; *Petrovic v. Austria*, §§ 26-29; *Di Trizio v. Switzerland*, §§ 60-62).

250. There is a broad consensus – including in international law – in support of the idea that in all decisions concerning children, their best interests must be paramount (*Neulinger and Shuruk v. Switzerland* [GC], § 135; *X v. Latvia* [GC], § 96). The child’s best interests may, depending on their

nature and seriousness, override those of the parents (*Sahin v. Germany* [GC], § 66). The parents' interests, especially in having regular contact with their child, nevertheless remain a factor when balancing the various interests at stake (*Neulinger and Shuruk v. Switzerland*, § 134). The child's interests dictate that the child's ties with the family must be maintained, except in cases where the family has proved particularly unfit. It follows that family ties may only be severed in very exceptional circumstances and that everything must be done to preserve personal relations and, if and when appropriate, to "rebuild" the family (*Gnahoré v. France*, § 59).

251. The Court has found that the failure to disclose relevant documents to parents during the procedures instituted by the authorities in placing and maintaining a child in care meant that the decision-making process determining the custody and access arrangements did not afford the requisite protection of the parents' interests as safeguarded by Article 8 (*T.P. and K.M. v. the United Kingdom* [GC], § 73). The refusal to order an independent psychological report and the absence of a hearing before a regional court insufficiently involved the applicant in the decision-making process regarding his parental access and thereby violated the applicant's rights under Article 8 (*Elsholz v. Germany* [GC], § 53).

252. A parent cannot be entitled under Article 8 to have such measures taken as would harm the child's health and development (*Elsholz v. Germany* [GC], § 50; *T.P. and K.M. v. the United Kingdom* [GC], § 71; *Ignaccolo-Zenide v. Romania*, § 94; *Nuutinen v. Finland*, § 128). Thus, where a 13-year-old girl had expressed her clear wish not to see her father, and had done so for several years, and where forcing her to see him would seriously disturb her emotional and psychological balance; the decision to refuse contact with the father can be taken to have been made in the interests of the child (*Sommerfeld v. Germany* [GC], §§ 64-65; *Buscemi v. Italy*, § 55). In a case of a putative father who asked to be provided with information about his alleged child and be allowed contact with her, despite her legal parents' refusal, the Court accepted that this would likely result in a break up of the child legal parents' marriage, thereby endangering the well-being of the child who would lose her family unit and her relationships (*Fröhlich v. Germany**, §§ 42 and 62-63). The Court found that the right to private and family life of a divorced couple's daughter had been violated as regards the length of the custody proceedings and, taking into account her age and maturity, the failure of the domestic courts to allow her to express her views on which parent should take care of her (*M. and M. v. Croatia*, §§ 171-172).

253. In cases concerning a parent's relationship with his or her child, there is a duty to exercise exceptional diligence in view of the risk that the passage of time may result in a *de facto* determination of the matter. This duty, which is decisive in assessing whether a case has been heard within a reasonable time as required by Article 6 § 1 of the Convention, also forms part of the procedural requirements implicit in Article 8 (*Ribić v. Croatia*, § 92).

254. States must also provide measures to ensure that custody determinations and parental rights are enforced (*Raw and Others v. France*; *Vorozhba v. Russia*, § 97; *Malec v. Poland*, § 78). This may, if necessary, include investigation into the whereabouts of the child whose location has been hidden by the other parent (*Hromadka and Hromadkova v. Russia*, § 168). The Court also found that in placing reliance on a series of automatic and stereotyped measures in order to secure the exercise of the father's contact rights in respect of his child, the domestic courts had not taken the appropriate measures to establish a meaningful relationship between the applicant and his child and to make the full exercise of his contact rights possible (*Giorgioni v. Italy*, §§ 75-77; *Macready v. the Czech Republic*, § 66; *Bondavalli v. Italy*, §§ 81-84). Likewise, a violation was found where no new independent psychiatric evidence concerning the applicant had been taken for around 10 years (*Cincimo v. Italy*, §§ 73-75). Another violation was found in the case where, over seven years, the applicant was unable to exercise his contact rights under the conditions set by the courts, owing to the opposition of the child's mother and the lack of appropriate measures taken by the domestic courts (*Strumia v. Italy*, §§ 122-125). The role of the domestic courts is thus to ascertain what steps can be taken to overcome existing barriers and to facilitate contact between the child and the

non-custodial parent; for example, the fact that the domestic courts had failed to consider any means that would have assisted an applicant in overcoming the barriers arising from his disability (deafness with communication by sign language, whereas his son was also deaf but could communicate orally) led the Court to find a violation (*Kacper Nowakowski v. Poland*, § 95).

255. With regard to measures which prevented the applicants from leaving confined areas and made it more difficult for them to exercise their right to maintain contact with family members living outside the enclave, the Court has found violations of Article 8 (*Nada v. Switzerland* [GC], §§ 165 and 198; *Agraw v. Switzerland*, § 51; *Mengesha Kimfe v. Switzerland*, §§ 69-72).

e. International child abduction

256. In matters of international child abduction, the obligations that Article 8 imposes on the Contracting States must be interpreted taking into account, in particular, the Hague Convention on the Civil Aspects of International Child Abduction of 25 October 1980 (*Iglesias Gil and A.U.I. v. Spain*, § 51; *Ignaccolo-Zenide v. Romania*, § 95) and the Convention on the Rights of the Child of 20 November 1989 (*Maire v. Portugal*, § 72).

257. In this area the decisive issue is whether a fair balance between the competing interests at stake – those of the child, of the two parents, and of the public order – has been struck, within the margin of appreciation afforded to States in such matters (*Maumousseau and Washington v. France*, § 62; *Rouiller v. Switzerland*), bearing in mind, however, that the child’s best interests must be the primary consideration (*Gnahoré v. France*, § 59; *X v. Latvia* [GC], § 95). In the latter case the Court found that there exists a broad consensus – including in international law – in support of the idea that in all decisions concerning children, their best interests must be paramount (§ 96). The parents’ interests, especially in having regular contact with their child, nevertheless remain a factor when balancing the various interests at stake (*ibid.*, § 95; *Kutzner v. Germany*, § 58). For example, parents must have an adequate opportunity to participate in the decision-making process (*López Guió v. Slovakia*).

258. In order to achieve a harmonious interpretation of the European Convention and the Hague Convention, the factors capable of constituting an exception to the child’s immediate return in application of Articles 12, 13 and 20 of the Hague Convention have, first of all, genuinely to be taken into account by the requested court, which has to issue a decision that is sufficiently reasoned on this point, and then to be evaluated in the light of Article 8 of the European Convention. It follows that Article 8 of the Convention imposes on the domestic authorities a procedural obligation, requiring that, when assessing an application for a child’s return, the courts have to consider arguable allegations of a “grave risk” for the child in the event of return and make a ruling giving specific reasons. As to the exact nature of the “grave risk”, the exception provided for in Article 13 (b) of the Hague Convention concerns only the situations which go beyond what a child could reasonably bear (*X v. Latvia* [GC], §§ 106-107).

259. The Court considers that exceeding the non-obligatory six-week time limit in Article 11 of the Hague Convention by a significant time, in the absence of any circumstances capable of exempting the domestic courts from the duty to strictly observe it, is not in compliance with the positive obligation to act expeditiously in proceedings for the return of children (*G.S. v. Georgia*, § 63; *G.N. v. Poland*, § 68; *K.J. v. Poland*, § 72; *Carlson v. Switzerland*, § 76; *Karrer v. Romania*, § 54; *R.S. v. Poland*, § 70; *Blaga v. Romania*, § 83; *Monory v. Romania and Hungary*, § 82).

260. Execution of judgments regarding child abduction must also be adequate and effective in light of their urgent nature (*V.P. v. Russia*, § 154).

f. Adoption

261. A lawful and genuine adoption may constitute family life, even in the absence of cohabitation or any real ties between an adopted child and the adoptive parents (*Pini and Others v. Romania*, §§ 143-148; *Topčić-Rosenberg v. Croatia*, § 38).

262. However, the provisions of Article 8 taken alone do not guarantee either the right to found a family or the right to adopt (*Paradiso and Campanelli v. Italy* [GC], § 141; *E.B. v. France* [GC]). Nor must a member State grant recognition to all forms of guardianship as adoption, such as “kafala” (*Harroudj v. France*, § 51; *Chbihi Loudoudi and Others v. Belgium*). The authorities enjoy a wide margin of appreciation in the area of adoption (*Wagner and J.M.W.L. v. Luxembourg*, § 128).

263. The Court has stated that the obligations imposed by Article 8 in the field of adoption and to the effects of adoption on the relationship between adopters and those being adopted must be interpreted in the light of the Hague Convention of 29 May 1993 on Protection of Children and Cooperation in respect of Intercountry Adoption, the United Nations Convention of 20 November 1989 on the Rights of the Child and the European Convention on the Adoption of Children (*Pini and Others v. Romania*, §§ 139-140).

264. The Court has also established that although the right to adopt is not, as such, included among the rights guaranteed by the Convention, the relations between an adoptive parent and an adopted child are as a rule of the same nature as the family relations protected by Article 8 of the Convention (*Kurochkin v. Ukraine*; *Ageyevy v. Russia*; *X. v. France*, Commission decision). There is no obligation under Article 8 to extend the right to second-parent adoption to unmarried couples (*X and Others v. Austria* [GC], § 136; *Gas and Dubois v. France*, §§ 66-69; *Emonet and Others v. Switzerland*, §§ 79-88). States do not have an obligation to treat married different-sex couples and unmarried same-sex couple on an equal footing as regards the conditions of access to adoption (*Gas and Dubois v. France*, § 68). However, once States have made adoption available to unmarried couples, it must become accessible to both different-sex and same-sex couples, provided that they are in a relevantly similar situation (*X and Others v. Austria* [GC], §§ 112 and 130). With respect to child adoption by one or more homosexual parents, the Court has noted divided opinion both within and between individual countries, and concluded that national authorities could legitimately and reasonably have considered the right to adopt asserted by the applicant to be circumscribed by the interests of adoptable children (*Fretté v. France*, § 42).

265. The principles relating to adoption are applicable even when the parties seek to enforce a foreign adoption decision, which is prohibited under the law of their native country (*Negrepontis-Giannisis v. Greece*).

266. A vacuum in Turkish civil law in relation to single parent adoption constituted a violation of Article 8; at the time the applicant had made her request, there had been no regulatory framework for recognition of the adoptive single parent’s forename in place of that of the natural parent (*Gözüm v. Turkey*, § 53).

267. Where the revocation of the applicants’ adoption of children completely deprived the applicants of their family life with the children and was irreversible and inconsistent with the aim of reuniting them, such a measure could only be applied in exceptional circumstances and justified by an overriding requirement pertaining to the children’s best interests (*Ageyevy v. Russia*, § 144; *Johansen v. Norway*; *Scozzari and Giunta v. Italy* [GC], § 148; *Zaiet v. Romania*, § 50).

268. *Paradiso and Campanelli v. Italy* [GC] concerned the separation and placement for adoption of a child conceived abroad through surrogacy and brought back to Italy in violation of Italian adoption laws (§ 215). The facts of the case touched on ethically sensitive issues – adoption, the taking of a child into care, medically assisted reproduction and surrogate motherhood – in which member States enjoyed a wide margin of appreciation (§ 194). The Court found that no family life had existed in this particular case and considered it under the notion of “private life”.

g. Foster families

269. The Court may recognise the existence of *de facto* family life between foster parents and a child placed with them, having regard to the time spent together, the quality of the relationship and the role played by the adult *vis-à-vis* the child (*Moretti and Benedetti v. Italy*, §§ 48-52, in which the Court found a violation of the state’s positive obligation in that the applicants’ request for a special adoption order in respect of the foster-child who had been placed with their family immediately after her birth for a period of five months had not been examined carefully before the baby had been declared free for adoption and another couple had been selected; see also *Jolie and Others v. Belgium*, Commission decision, for examination of the relationship between foster parents and children for whom they have been caring).

270. The Court has also held (in the context of determining whether there existed a right to see files relating to fostering arrangements) that persons in the situation of the applicant (a former foster child) had a vital interest, protected by the Convention, in receiving the information necessary to know and to understand their childhood and early development (*Gaskin v. the United Kingdom*, § 49).

h. Parental authority and State care

271. Family life does not end when a child is taken into public care (*Johansen v. Norway*, § 52; *Eriksson v. Sweden*, § 58), or the upon the parents’ divorce (*Mustafa and Armağan Akin v. Turkey*, § 19). It is well established that removing children from the care of their parents to place them in the care of the state constitutes an interference with respect for family life that requires justification under paragraph 2 of Article 8 (*Kutzner v. Germany*, §§ 58-60).

272. The Court has established that the authorities enjoy a wide margin of appreciation when assessing the necessity of taking a child into care (*B.B. and F.B. v. Germany*, § 47; *Johansen v. Norway*, § 64). Moreover, it must be borne in mind that the national authorities have the benefit of direct contact with all the persons concerned (*Olsson v. Sweden (no. 2)*, § 90), often at the very stage when care measures are being envisaged or immediately after their implementation. A stricter scrutiny is called for, however, in respect of any further limitations, such as restrictions placed by those authorities on parental rights of access (*Elsholz v. Germany* [GC], § 64; *A.D. and O.D. v. the United Kingdom*, § 83).

273. In two cases concerning systematic recourse to corporal punishment in child-rearing, the main aim was to determine whether the decision-making process, seen as a whole, had provided the parents with the requisite protection of their interests and whether the measures chosen had been proportionate (*Wetjen and Others v. Germany*, § 79; *Tlapak and Others v. Germany*, § 92). Thus, the withdrawal of parental authority, which should only be applied as a measure of last resort, must be confined to the aspects strictly necessary to prevent any real and imminent risk of degrading treatment and only used in respect of children running such a risk (*Wetjen and Others v. Germany*, § 84; *Tlapak and Others v. Germany*, § 97). Moreover, the domestic courts must give detailed reasons why there was no other option available to protect the children and which entailed less of an infringement of the family’s rights (*Wetjen and Others v. Germany*, § 85; *Tlapak and Others v. Germany*, § 98). The procedural obligations implicit in Article 8 also include ensuring that the parents are in a position to put forward all their arguments (*Wetjen and Others v. Germany*, § 80; *Tlapak and Others v. Germany*, § 93). Those obligations also require the findings of the domestic courts to be based on a sufficient factual foundation and not to appear arbitrary or unreasonable (*Wetjen and Others v. Germany*, § 81). For instance, in *Wetjen and Others v. Germany*, the domestic authorities relied on statements by the parents and the children themselves in finding that the latter had been, or were liable to be, caned.

274. Mistaken judgments or assessments by professionals do not *per se* render childcare measures incompatible with the requirements of Article 8 (*B.B. and F.B. v. Germany*, § 48). The authorities,

both medical and social, have a duty to protect children and cannot be held liable every time genuine and reasonably held concerns about the safety of children *vis-à-vis* members of their family are proved, retrospectively, to have been misguided (*R.K. and A.K. v. the United Kingdom*, § 36; *A.D. and O.D. v. the United Kingdom*, § 84). It follows that the domestic decisions can only be examined in the light of the situation such as it presented itself to the domestic authorities at the time these decisions were taken (*B.B. and F.B. v. Germany*, § 48).

275. Thus, where domestic authorities were confronted with at least *prima facie* credible allegations of severe physical abuse, the temporary withdrawal of parental authority was sufficiently justified (*B.B. and F.B. v. Germany*, § 49). However, a decision to withdraw parental authority permanently did not provide sufficient reasons in the main proceedings and was thus an Article 8 violation (*Ibid.*, §§ 51-52). In *Wetjen and Others v. Germany*, the Court found that the risk of systematic and regular caning constituted a relevant reason to withdraw parts of the parents' authority and to take the children into care (§ 78) (see also *Tlapak and Others v. Germany*, § 91). The Court assessed whether the domestic courts had struck a fair balance between the parents' interests and the best interests of the children (*Wetjen and Others v. Germany*, §§ 79-85).

276. Where withdrawal of parental authority had been based on a distinction essentially deriving from religious considerations, the Court held that there had been a violation of Article 8 in conjunction with Article 14 (*Hoffmann v. Austria*, § 36, concerning the withdrawal of parental rights from the applicant after she divorced the father of their two children because she was a Jehovah's Witness). Furthermore, where a healthy infant was taken into care because the mother chose to leave the hospital earlier than recommended by the doctors, this decision was disproportionate and in violation of Article 8 (*Hanzelkovi v. the Czech Republic*, § 79).

277. The fact that a child could be placed in a more beneficial environment for his or her upbringing will not on its own justify a compulsory measure of removal from the care of the biological parents; there must exist other circumstances pointing to the "necessity" for such an interference with the parents' right under Article 8 to enjoy a family life with their child (*K. and T. v. Finland* [GC], § 173). Nor can a mother's financial situation, without regard for changed circumstances, justify the removal of a child from her mother's care (*R.M.S. v. Spain*, § 92). Likewise, a breach was found where domestic authorities had merely based their decision on the applicant's financial and social difficulties, without providing him with appropriate social assistance (*Akinnibosun v. Italy*, §§ 83-84). In *Soares De Melo v. Portugal*, the Court found a violation of Article 8 where the children of a woman living in precarious conditions were placed in care with a view to adoption, resulting in the severance of the family ties (§§ 118-123).

278. A care order should be regarded as a temporary measure, to be discontinued as soon as circumstances permit, and any measures implementing temporary care should be consistent with the ultimate aim of reuniting the natural parents and the child (in particular, *Olsson v. Sweden (no. 1)*, § 81). The positive duty to take measures to facilitate family reunification as soon as reasonably feasible will begin to weigh on the competent authorities with progressively increasing force as from the commencement of the period of care, subject always to its being balanced against the duty to consider the best interests of the child (*K. and T. v. Finland* [GC], § 178). The Court found a violation of Article 8 where the domestic authorities, by declaring the children of the applicant adoptable, did not make all the necessary efforts to preserve the parent-child relationship (*S.H. v. Italy*, § 58).

279. Article 8 demands that decisions of courts aimed in principle at facilitating visits between parents and their children, so that they can re-establish relations with a view to reunification of the family, must be implemented in an effective and coherent manner. No logical purpose would be served in deciding that visits may take place if the manner in which the decision is implemented means that *de facto* the child is irreversibly separated from its natural parent. Accordingly, authorities failed to strike a fair balance between the interests of an applicant and her children

under Article 8 as a result of the absence of any time-limit on a care order and the negative conduct and attitudes of those at the care centre which drove the first applicant's children towards an irreversible separation from their mother (*Scozzari and Giunta v. Italy* [GC], §§ 181 and 215).

280. An emergency care order placing an applicant's child in public care and the authorities' failure to take sufficient steps towards a possible reunification of the applicants' family regardless of any evidence of a positive improvement in the applicants' situation was also a violation of the right to family life, but subsequent normal care orders and access restrictions were not (*K. and T. v. Finland* [GC], §§ 170, 174, 179 and 194).

4. Other family relationships

a. As between siblings, grandparents

281. Family life can also exist between siblings (*Moustaquim v. Belgium*, § 36; *Mustafa and Armağan Akin v. Turkey*, § 19) and aunts/uncles and nieces/nephews (*Boyle v. the United Kingdom*, §§ 41-47). However, the traditional approach is that close relationships short of family life generally fall within the scope of private life (*Znamenskaya v. Russia*, § 27 and the references cited therein).

282. The Court has recognised the relationship between adults and their parents and siblings as constituting family life protected under Article 8 even where the adult did not live with his parents or siblings (*Boughanemi v. France*, § 35) and the adult had formed a separate household and family (*Moustaquim v. Belgium*, §§ 35 and 45-46; *El Boujaïdi v. France*, § 33).

283. The Court has stated that family life includes at least the ties between near relatives, for instance those between grandparents and grandchildren, since such relatives may play a considerable part in family life (*Marckx v. Belgium*, § 45; *Price v. the United Kingdom*, Commission decision). The right to respect for family life of grandparents in relation to their grandchildren primarily entails the right to maintain a normal grandparent-grandchild relationship through contact between them (*Kruškić v. Croatia* (dec.), § 111; *Mitovi v. the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia*, § 58). However, the Court considers that contact between grandparents and grandchildren normally take place with the agreement of the person who has parental responsibility, which means that access of a grandparent to his or her grandchild is normally at the discretion of the child's parents (*Kruškić v. Croatia* (dec.), § 112).

284. The principle of mutual enjoyment by parent and child of each other's company also applies in cases involving relations between a child and its grandparents (*L. v. Finland*, § 101). Particularly where the natural parents are absent, family ties have been held to exist between uncles and aunts and nieces and nephews (*Butt v. Norway*, §§ 4 and 76; *Jucius and Juciuvienė v. Lithuania*, § 27). However, in normal circumstances the relationship between grandparents and grandchildren is different in nature and degree from the relationship between parent and child and thus by its very nature generally calls for a lesser degree of protection (*Kruškić v. Croatia* (dec.), § 110; *Mitovi v. the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia*, § 58).

285. In more recent jurisprudence, the Court has stated that family ties between adults and their parents or siblings attract lesser protection unless there is evidence of further elements of dependency, involving more than the normal emotional ties (*Benhebba v. France*, § 36; *Mokrani v. France*, § 33; *Onur v. the United Kingdom*, § 45; *Slivenko v. Latvia* [GC], § 97; *A.H. Khan v. the United Kingdom*, § 32).

b. Prisoner's right to contact

286. It is an essential part of a prisoner's right to respect for family life that the prison authorities assist him or her in maintaining contact with his or her close family (*Messina v. Italy (no. 2)*, § 61; *Kurkowski v. Poland*, § 95; *Vintman v. Ukraine*, § 78). The Court attached considerable importance to

the recommendations of the European Committee for the Prevention of Torture and Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment (CPT), which noted that long-term prison regimes “should seek to compensate for the desocialising effects of imprisonment in a positive and proactive way” (*Khoroshenko v. Russia* [GC], § 144). Restrictions such as limitations put on the number of family visits, supervision of those visits and, subjection of a detainee to a special prison regime or special visit arrangements constitute an interference with his rights under Article 8 (*Piechowicz v. Poland*, § 212; *Van der Ven v. the Netherlands*, § 69; *Khoroshenko v. Russia* [GC], §§ 106 and 146; *Mozer v. the Republic of Moldova and Russia* [GC], §§ 193-195; *Vidish v. Russia*, § 40). Likewise, the refusal to transfer the applicant to a prison closer to his parents’ home constituted a violation of Article 8 (*Rodzevillo v. Ukraine*, §§ 85-87; *Khodorkovskiy and Lebedev v. Russia*, §§ 831-851). In *Polyakova and Others v. Russia*, the Court found a breach of Article 8 on account of the failure of the applicable domestic law to provide sufficient safeguards against abuse in the field of geographical distribution of prisoners (§ 116).

287. In the context of intra-State transfers, while the domestic authorities have a wide discretion in matters relating to execution of sentences, such discretion is not absolute, particularly as regards the distribution of the prison population (*Rodzevillo v. Ukraine*, no. 38771/05, § 83, 14 January 2016). The Court has also ruled on inter-State prison transfer requests. In *Serce v. Romania*, § 56, the applicant, a Turkish national serving an 18-year prison sentence in Romania, complained about the refusal of the Romanian authorities to transfer him to another Council of Europe member State, Turkey, to serve the remainder of his sentence there, close to his wife and children. Despite having found that the unhygienic conditions in which he had been detained in Romania, the lack of activities or work and the prison overcrowding to which he was subject breached his Article 3 rights, the Court confirmed that Article 8 of the Convention was not applicable to his request for an inter-State prison transfer. In *Palfreeman v. Bulgaria* (dec.), concerning the authorities’ refusal to transfer a prisoner to a non-member State of the Council of Europe, the Court pointed out that the Convention did not grant prisoners the right to choose their place of detention (§ 36) and examined the question of the applicability of Article 8 in the light of the provisions of the relevant bilateral treaty on the transfer of sentenced prisoners (§§ 33-36).

288. A refusal to allow a prisoner to attend the funerals of his parents was held to amount to an interference with the respect for private and family life (*Płoski v. Poland*, § 39). However, the Court deemed a decision to restrict visitation rights for a prisoner to be necessary and proportionate given the necessity of the specific prison regime that was in force at the time (*Enea v. Italy* [GC], §§ 131-135).

5. Immigration and expulsion

289. The Court has affirmed that a State is entitled, as a matter of international law and subject to its treaty obligations, to control the entry of aliens into its territory and their residence there (*Abdulaziz, Cabales and Balkandali v. the United Kingdom*, § 67; *Boujlifa v. France*, § 42). Moreover, the Convention does not guarantee the right of a foreign national to enter or to reside in a particular country. Thus, there is no obligation for the domestic authorities to allow an alien to settle in their country (*Jeunesse v. the Netherlands* [GC], § 103). The corollary of a State’s right to control immigration is the duty of aliens such as the applicant to submit to immigration controls and procedures and leave the territory of the Contracting State when so ordered if they are lawfully denied entry or residence (*Ibid.*, § 100). However, the Court has found a violation of Article 8 where the authorities had failed to secure the applicant’s right to respect for his private life by not putting in place an effective and accessible procedure, which would have allowed the applicant’s asylum request to be examined within a reasonable time, thus reducing as much as possible the precariousness of his situation (*B.A.C. v. Greece*, § 46).

a. Children in detention centres

290. Whilst mutual enjoyment by parent and child of each other's company constitutes a fundamental element of family life (*Olsson v. Sweden (no. 1)*, § 59), it cannot be inferred from this that the sole fact that the family unit is maintained necessarily guarantees respect for the right to a family life, particularly where the family is detained (*Popov v. France*, § 134; *Bistieva and Others v. Poland*, § 73). A measure of confinement must be proportionate to the aim pursued by the authorities; where families are concerned, the authorities must, in assessing proportionality, take account of the child's best interests (*Popov v. France*, § 140). Where a State systematically detained accompanied immigrant minors in the absence of any indication that the family was going to abscond, the measure of detention for fifteen days in a secure centre was disproportionate to the aim pursued and a violation of Article 8 (*Ibid.*, §§ 147-148). The Court also found a violation of Article 8 where a family was held in administrative detention for eighteen and nine days respectively while the authorities did not take all necessary measures to execute the decision of expulsion and there was no particular flight risk (*A.B. and Others v. France*, §§ 155-156; *R.K. and Others v. France*, §§ 114 and 117). In two other cases, however, the detention of a family for a period of eight and ten days was not considered disproportionate (*A.M. and Others v. France*, § 97; *R.C. and V.C. v. France*, § 83).

291. In the case of *Bistieva and Others v. Poland*, the application was lodged by a family who had been held in a secure centre for five months, twenty days following their transfer from Germany. They had fled there shortly after their first asylum application had been rejected by the Polish authorities (§ 79). The Court held that even in the light of the risk that the family might abscond, the authorities had failed to provide sufficient reasons to justify their detention for a much longer period (§ 88). Indeed, the detention of minors calls for greater speed and diligence on the part of the authorities (§ 87).

292. The States' interest in foiling attempts to circumvent immigration rules must not deprive foreign minors, especially if unaccompanied, of the protection their status warrants (*Mubilanzila Mayeka and Kaniki Mitunga v. Belgium*, § 81). Where the risk of the second applicant's seeking to evade the supervision of the Belgian authorities was minimal, her detention in a closed centre for adults was unnecessary (§ 83).

b. Family reunification

293. Where immigration is concerned, Article 8, taken alone, cannot be considered to impose on a State a general obligation to respect a married couple's choice of country for their matrimonial residence or to authorise family reunification on its territory (*Jeunesse v. the Netherlands* [GC], § 107; *Biao v. Denmark* [GC], § 117). Nevertheless, in a case which concerns family life as well as immigration, the extent of a State's obligations to admit to its territory relatives of persons residing there will vary according to the particular circumstances of the persons involved and the general interest (*Abdulaziz, Cabales and Balkandali v. the United Kingdom*, §§ 67-68; *Gül v. Switzerland*, § 38; *Ahmut v. the Netherlands*, § 63; *Sen v. the Netherlands*; *Osman v. Denmark*, § 54; *Berisha v. Switzerland*, § 60).

294. Factors to be taken into account in this context are the extent to which family life is effectively ruptured, the extent of the ties in the Contracting State, whether there are insurmountable obstacles in the way of the family living in the country of origin of one or more of them and whether there are factors of immigration control (for example, a history of breaches of immigration law) or considerations of public order weighing in favour of exclusion (*Rodrigues da Silva and Hoogkamer v. the Netherlands*, § 38; *Ajayi and Others v. the United Kingdom* (dec.); *Solomon v. the Netherlands* (dec.)).

295. Another important consideration is whether family life was created at a time when the persons involved were aware that the immigration status of one of them was such that the persistence of

that family life within the host State would from the outset be precarious (*Sarumi v. the United Kingdom* (dec.); *Shebashov v. Latvia* (dec.)). Where this is the case the removal of the non-national family member would be incompatible with Article 8 only in exceptional circumstances (*Abdulaziz, Cabales and Balkandali v. the United Kingdom*, § 68; *Mitchell v. the United Kingdom* (dec.); *Ajayi and Others v. the United Kingdom* (dec.); *Rodrigues da Silva and Hoogkamer v. the Netherlands*; *Biao v. Denmark* [GC], § 138). The family reunification process must also be adequately transparent and processed without undue delays (*Tanda-Muzinga v. France*, § 82).

c. Deportation and expulsion decisions

296. A State's entitlement to control the entry of aliens into its territory and their residence there applies regardless of whether an alien entered the host country as an adult or at a very young age, or was perhaps even born there (*Üner v. the Netherlands* [GC], § 54). While a number of Contracting States have enacted legislation or adopted policy rules to the effect that long-term immigrants who were born in those States or who arrived there during early childhood cannot be expelled on the basis of their criminal record, such an absolute right not to be expelled cannot be derived from Article 8 (*Ibid.*, § 55). However, very serious reasons are required to justify expulsion of a settled migrant who has lawfully spent all or the major part of his or her childhood and youth in a host country (*Maslov v. Austria*, § 75). Taking into account the applicant's family life and the fact that he only committed one serious crime in 1999, the Court stated that the expulsion of the applicant to Albania and a lifetime ban on returning to Greece violated Article 8 of the Convention (*Kolonja v. Greece*, §§ 57-58).

297. In assessing such cases, the Court also examines the best interests and well-being of the children, in particular the seriousness of the difficulties which any children of the applicant are likely to encounter in the country to which the applicant is to be expelled; and the solidity of social, cultural and family ties with the host country and with the country of destination (*Üner v. the Netherlands* [GC], § 58; *Udeh v. Switzerland*, § 52). The Court has affirmed that the best interests of minor children should be taken into account in the balancing exercise with regard to expulsion of a parent, including the hardship of returning to the country of origin of the parent (*Jeunesse v. the Netherlands* [GC], §§ 117-118).

298. In immigration cases, there will be no family life between parents and adult children unless they can demonstrate additional elements of dependence other than normal emotional ties (*Kwakyie-Nti and Dufie v. the Netherlands* (dec.); *Slivenko v. Latvia* [GC], § 97; *A.S. v. Switzerland*, § 49). However, such ties may be taken into account under the head of "private life" (*Slivenko v. Latvia* [GC]). The Court has accepted in a number of cases concerning young adults who have not yet founded a family of their own that their relationship with their parents and other close family members also constitutes family life (*Maslov v. Austria*, § 62).

299. Where expulsions are challenged on the basis of alleged interference with private and family life, it is not imperative, in order for a remedy to be effective, that it should have automatic suspensive effect (*De Souza Ribeiro v. France* [GC], § 83). Nevertheless, in immigration matters, where there is an arguable claim that expulsion threatens to interfere with the alien's right to respect for his or her private and family life, Article 13 in conjunction with Article 8 of the Convention requires that States must make available to the individual concerned the effective possibility of challenging the deportation or refusal-of-residence order and of having the relevant issues examined with sufficient procedural safeguards and thoroughness by an appropriate domestic forum offering adequate guarantees of independence and impartiality (*M. and Others v. Bulgaria*, §§ 122-132; *Al-Nashif v. Bulgaria*, § 133).

300. The Court has found a violation of the applicant's right to respect for his private and family life where the obligation not to abscond and the seizure of the applicant's international travel passports

prevented the applicant from travelling to Germany, where he had lived for several years and where his family continued to live (*Kotiy v. Ukraine*, § 76).

301. The proposed deportation of a person suffering from serious illness to his country of origin in face of doubts as to the availability of appropriate medical treatment there, would have constituted a violation of Article 8 (*Paposhvili v. Belgium* [GC], §§ 221-226).

d. Residence permits

302. Neither Article 8 nor any other provision of the Convention can be construed as guaranteeing, as such, the right to the granting of a particular type of residence permit, provided that a solution offered by the authorities allows the individual concerned to exercise without obstacles his or her right to respect for private and/or family life (*B.A.C. v. Greece*, § 35). In particular, if a residence permit allows the holder to reside within the territory of the host country and to exercise freely there the right to respect for his or her private and family life, the granting of such a permit represents in principle a sufficient measure to meet the requirements of Article 8. In such cases, the Court is not empowered to rule on whether the individual concerned should be granted one particular legal status rather than another, that choice being a matter for the domestic authorities alone (*Hoti v. Croatia*, § 121).

6. Material interests

303. “Family life” does not include only social, moral or cultural relations; it also comprises interests of a material kind, as is shown by, among other things, maintenance obligations and the position occupied in the domestic legal systems of the majority of the Contracting States by the institution of the reserved portion of an estate (in French, “*réserve héréditaire*”). The Court has thus accepted that the right of succession between children and parents, and between grandchildren and grandparents, is so closely related to family life that it comes within the ambit of Article 8 (*Marckx v. Belgium*, § 52; *Pla and Puncernau v. Andorra*, § 26). Article 8 does not, however, require that a child should be entitled to be recognised as the heir of a deceased person for inheritance purposes (*Haas v. the Netherlands*, § 43).

304. The Court has held that the granting of family allowance enables States to “demonstrate their respect for family life” within the meaning of Article 8; the allowance therefore comes within the scope of that provision (*Fawsie v. Greece*, § 28).

305. However, the Court has found that the concept of family life is not applicable to a claim for damages against a third party following the death of the applicant’s fiancée (*Hofmann v. Germany* (dec.)).

IV. Home⁶

A. General points

1. Scope of the notion of “home”

306. The notion of “home” is an autonomous concept which does not depend on the classification under domestic law (*Chiragov and Others v. Armenia* [GC], § 206). Accordingly, the answer to the question whether a habitation constitutes a “home” under the protection of Article 8 § 1 depends on the factual circumstances, namely the existence of sufficient and continuous links with a specific place (*Winterstein and Others v. France*, § 141 and the references cited therein; *Prokopovich v. Russia*, § 36; *McKay-Kopecka v. Poland* (dec.); for the case of a forced displacement, see *Chiragov*

6. See also the chapter on Environmental issues.

and Others v. Armenia [GC], §§ 206-207, and *Sargsyan v. Azerbaijan* [GC], § 260). Furthermore, the word “home” appearing in the English version of Article 8 is a term that is not to be strictly construed as the equivalent French term, “*domicile*”, has a broader connotation (*Niemietz v. Germany*, § 30).

307. “Home” is not limited to property of which the applicant is the owner or tenant. It may extend to long-term occupancy, on an annual basis, for long periods, of a house belonging to a relative (*Mentes and Others v. Turkey*, § 73). “Home” is not limited to those which are lawfully established (*Buckley v. the United Kingdom*, § 54) and may be claimed by a person living in a flat whose lease is not in his or her name (*Prokopovich v. Russia*, § 36). It may apply to a council house occupied by the applicant as tenant, even if, under domestic law, the right of occupation had ended (*McCann v. the United Kingdom*, § 46), or to occupancy for several years (*Brežec v. Croatia*, § 36).

308. “Home” is not limited to traditional residences. It therefore includes, among other things, caravans and other unfixed abodes (*Chapman v. the United Kingdom* [GC], §§ 71-74). It includes cabins or bungalows stationed on land, regardless of the question of the lawfulness of the occupation under domestic law (*Winterstein and Others v. France*, § 141; *Yordanova and Others v. Bulgaria*, § 103). Article 8 may also apply to second homes or holiday homes (*Demades v. Turkey*, §§ 32-34; *Fägerskiöld v. Sweden* (dec.)).

309. This concept extends to a professional person’s office or business premises (*Buck v. Germany*, § 31; *Niemietz v. Germany*, §§ 29-31), a newspaper’s premises (*Saint-Paul Luxembourg S.A. v. Luxembourg*, § 37), a notary’s practice (*Popovi v. Bulgaria*, § 103), or a university professor’s office (*Stegg v. Germany* (dec.)). It also applies to a registered office, and to the branches or other business premises of a company (*Société Colas Est and Others v. France*, § 41; *Kent Pharmaceuticals Limited and Others v. the United Kingdom* (dec.)).

310. Furthermore, the Court does not rule out the possibility that training centres and venues for sports events and competitions, and their annexes, such as a hotel room in the case of away events, may be treated as equivalent to “home” within the meaning of Article 8 (*National federation of Sportspersons’ Associations and unions (FNASS) and Others v. France*, § 158).

311. Whilst the Court has acknowledged the existence of a “home” in favour of an association complaining of surveillance measures (*Association for European Integration and Human Rights and Ekimdzhiev v. Bulgaria*), an association cannot itself claim to be a victim of a violation of the right to respect for one’s home on account of pollution (*Asselbourg and Others v. Luxembourg* (dec.)).

312. The Court has laid down certain limits on the extension of the protection of Article 8. It does not apply to property on which it is intended to build a house, or to the fact of having roots in a particular area (*Loizidou v. Turkey (merits)*, § 66); neither does it extend to a laundry room, jointly owned by the co-owners of a block of flats, designed for occasional use (*Chelu v. Romania*, § 45); an artist’s dressing-room (*Hartung v. France* (dec.)); land used by the owners for sports purposes or over which the owner permits a sport to be conducted (for example, hunting, *Friend and Others v. the United Kingdom* (dec.), § 45); industrial buildings and facilities, such as mill, bakery or storage facility used exclusively for professional purposes (*Khamidov v. Russia*, § 131) or for housing farm animals (*Leveau and Fillon v. France* (dec.)).

313. Additionally, where “home” is claimed in respect of property in which there has never been any, or hardly any, occupation by the applicant or where there has been no occupation for some considerable time, it may be that the links to that property are so attenuated as to cease to raise any issue under Article 8 (*Andreou Papi v. Turkey*, § 54). The possibility of inheriting title to property is not a sufficiently concrete link for the Court to conclude that there is a “home” (*Demopoulos and Others v. Turkey* (dec.) [GC], §§ 136-137). Moreover, Article 8 does not extend to guaranteeing the right to buy a house (*Strunjak and Others v. Croatia* (dec.)) or imposing a general obligation on the authorities to comply with the choice of joint residence elected by a married couple (*Mengesha*

Kimfe v. Switzerland, § 61). Article 8 does not in terms recognise a right to be provided with a home (*Ward v. the United Kingdom* (dec.); *Codona v. the United Kingdom* (dec.)).

2. Examples of “interference”

314. The following can be cited as examples of possible “interference” with the right to respect for one’s home:

- deliberate destruction of the home by the authorities (*Selçuk and Asker v. Turkey*, § 86; *Akdivar and Others v. Turkey* [GC], § 88; *Menteş and Others v. Turkey*, § 73) or confiscation (*Aboufadda v. France* (dec.));
- refusal to allow displaced persons to return to their homes (*Cyprus v. Turkey* [GC], § 174) which may amount to a “continuing violation” of Article 8;
- the transfer of the inhabitants of a village by decision of the authorities (*Noack and Others v. Germany* (dec.));
- police entry into a person’s home (*Gutsanovi v. Bulgaria*, § 217) and search (*Murray v. the United Kingdom*, § 86);
- searches and seizures (*Chappell v. the United Kingdom*, §§ 50-51; *Funke v. France*, § 48), knowing that cooperation with the police not to be construed as meaning there was no “interference” (*Saint-Paul Luxembourg S.A. v. Luxembourg*, § 38) and that the offence giving rise to the search had been committed by a third party is irrelevant (*Buck v. Germany*);
- occupation or damaging of property (*Khamidov v. Russia*, § 138) or expulsion from home (*Orlić v. Croatia*, § 56 and the references therein), including an eviction order which has not yet been enforced (*Gladyшева v. Russia*, § 91; *Ćosić v. Croatia*, § 22).

315. Other examples of “interference” are:

- changes to the terms of a tenancy (*Berger-Krall and Others v. Slovenia*, § 264);
- loss of one’s home on account of a deportation order (*Slivenko v. Latvia* [GC], § 96);
- impossibility for a couple, under the immigration rules, to set up home together and live together in a family unit (*Hode and Abdi v. the United Kingdom*, § 43);
- decisions regarding planning permission (*Buckley v. the United Kingdom*, § 60);
- compulsory purchase orders (*Howard v. the United Kingdom*, Commission decision) and an order to companies to provide tax auditors with access to premises and to enable them to take a copy of data on a server (*Bernh Larsen Holding AS and Others v. Norway*, § 106).

316. The Court has found other instances of “interference” with the right of respect for home, such as, for example:

- an order to vacate from land caravans, cabins or bungalows that had been illegally stationed there for many years (*Winterstein and Others v. France*, § 143) or illegal makeshift homes (*Yordanova and Others v. Bulgaria*, § 104);
- a person’s inability to have their name removed from the register of permanent residences (*Babylonová v. Slovakia*, § 52);
- obligation to obtain a licence to live in one’s own house and imposition of a fine for unlawful occupation of own property (*Gillow v. the United Kingdom*, § 47).

The Court has also found that the inability of displaced persons, in the context of a conflict, to return to their homes amounted to an “interference” with the exercise of their rights under Article 8 (*Chiragov and Others v. Armenia* [GC], § 207; *Sargsyan v. Azerbaijan* [GC], § 260).

3. Margin of appreciation

317. In so far as, in this area, the questions in issue may depend on a multitude of local factors and pertain to the choice of town and country planning policies, the Contracting States in principle enjoy a wide margin of appreciation (*Noack and Others v. Germany* (dec.)). However, it remains open to the Court to conclude that there has been a manifest error of appreciation (*Chapman v. the United Kingdom* [GC], § 92). The implementation of these choices may infringe the right to respect for one's home, without however raising an issue under the Convention where certain conditions are satisfied and accompanying measures implemented (*Noack and Others v. Germany* (dec.)). However, where the right at stake is crucial to the individual's effective enjoyment of intimate or key rights, the margin of appreciation will tend to be narrower (*Connors v. the United Kingdom*, § 82).

B. Housing

318. Article 8 cannot be construed as recognising a right to be provided with a home (*Chapman v. the United Kingdom* [GC], § 99) or as conferring a right to live in a particular location (*Garib v. the Netherlands*, [GC], § 141). The right to respect for one's home means not just the right to the actual physical area, but also to the quiet enjoyment of that area. This may involve measures that are required to be taken by the authorities, particularly regarding the enforcement of court decisions (*Cvijetić v. Croatia*, §§ 51-53). An interference may be either physical, such as unauthorised entry into a person's home (*Cyprus v. Turkey* [GC], § 294), or not physical, such as noise, smells, etc. (*Moreno Gómez v. Spain*, § 53).

319. Whilst Article 8 protects individuals against interference by public authorities, it may also entail the State's adoption of measures to secure the right to respect for one's "home" (*Novoseletskiy v. Ukraine*, § 68), even in the sphere of relations between individuals (*Surugiu v. Romania*, § 59). The Court has found a breach by the State of its positive obligations on account of failure by the authorities to take action following the repeated complaints by an applicant that people were coming into his courtyard and emptying cartloads of manure in front of his door and windows (*Ibid.*, §§ 67-68; for a case in which the authorities were found not to have failed to comply with their positive obligation, see *Osman v. the United Kingdom*, §§ 129-130). Failure by the national authorities to enforce an eviction order from a flat, in favour of the owner, was deemed to amount to a failure by the State to comply with its positive obligations under Article 8 (*Pibernik v. Croatia*, § 70). Late restitution by the public authorities of a flat in a condition unfit for human habitation was held to infringe the right to respect for the applicant's home (*Novoseletskiy v. Ukraine*, §§ 84-88).

320. The Court requires the member States to weigh up the competing interests at stake (*Hatton and Others v. the United Kingdom* [GC], § 98), whether the case is examined from the point of view of an interference by a public authority that has to be justified under paragraph 2 of Article 8, or from that of positive obligations requiring the State to adopt a legal framework to protect the right to respect for one's home under paragraph 1.

321. With regard to the scope of the State's margin of appreciation in this area, particular significance has to be attached to the extent of the intrusion into the applicant's personal sphere (*Connors v. the United Kingdom*, § 82; *Gladysheva v. Russia*, §§ 91-96). Having regard to the crucial importance of the rights guaranteed under Article 8 to the individual's identity, self-determination, and physical and moral integrity, the margin of appreciation in housing matters is narrower when it comes to the rights guaranteed by Article 8 compared to those in Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 (*Ibid.*, § 93).

322. The Court will have particular regard to the procedural guarantees in determining whether the State has exceeded its margin of appreciation when defining the applicable legal framework (*Connors v. the United Kingdom*, § 92). It has held, *inter alia*, that the loss of one's home is a most extreme form of interference with the right to respect for the home. Any person at risk of an interference of this magnitude should in principle be able to have the proportionality of the measure

determined by an independent tribunal in the light of the relevant principles under Article 8 of the Convention, notwithstanding that, under domestic law, his right of occupation has come to an end (*McCann v. the United Kingdom*, § 50).

1. Property owners

323. Where a State authority is dealing with a bona fide purchaser of property that had been fraudulently acquired by the previous owner, the national courts cannot automatically order eviction without examining more closely the proportionality of the measure or the particular circumstances of the case. The fact that the house is repossessed by the State, and not by another private party whose interests in that particular flat would have been at stake, is also of particular importance (*Gladysheva v. Russia*, §§ 90-97).

324. It will sometimes be necessary for a member State to attach and sell an individual's home in order to secure the payment of taxes due to the State. However, these measures must be enforced in a manner which ensures that the individual's right to his or her home is respected. In a case concerning the conditions of an enforced sale at auction of a house, to repay a tax debt, the Court found a violation because the owner's interests had not been adequately protected (*Rousk v. Sweden*, §§ 137-142). With regard, more generally, to reconciliation of the right to respect for one's home with the enforced sale of a house for the purposes of paying debts, see *Vrzić v. Croatia*, § 13.

325. The obligation to seek a licence to occupy a house owned on an island, in order to prevent overpopulation of the island, is not in itself contrary to Article 8. However, the proportionality requirement is not satisfied if the national authorities fail to give sufficient weight, *inter alia*, to the particular circumstances of the property owners (*Gillow v. the United Kingdom*, §§ 56-58).

326. The Court has examined the question of the imminent loss of a house following a decision to demolish it on the grounds that it had been built without a permit in breach of the applicable building regulations (*Ivanova and Cherkezov v. Bulgaria*). The Court mainly examined whether the demolition was "necessary in a democratic society". It relied on the judgments it had delivered in previous cases in which it had found that proceedings to evict from a house had to comply with the interests protected by Article 8, the loss of one's home being a most extreme form of interference with the right to respect for the home, whether or not the person concerned belonged to a vulnerable group. In concluding that there had been a violation of Article 8 in this case, the Court based itself on the finding that the issue before the national courts was only that of illegality and they had confined themselves to examining that question, without examining the potentially disproportionate effect of enforcement of the demolition order on the applicants' personal situation (*Ibid.*, §§ 49-62).

327. The Court has also held that where a State adopts a legal framework obliging a private individual to share his or her home with persons foreign to his or her household, it must put in place thorough regulations and necessary procedural safeguards to enable all the parties concerned to protect their Convention interests (*Irina Smirnova v. Ukraine*, § 94).

2. Tenants

328. The Court has ruled on a number of disputes relating to the eviction of tenants (see the references cited in *Ivanova and Cherkezov v. Bulgaria*, § 52). A notice to quit issued by the authorities must be necessary and comply with procedural guarantees as part of a fair decision-making process before an independent tribunal complying with the requirements of Article 8 (*Connors v. the United Kingdom*, §§ 81-84; *Bjedov v. Croatia*, §§ 70-71). It is insufficient merely to indicate that the measure is prescribed by domestic law, without taking into account the individual circumstances in question (*Čosić v. Croatia*, § 21). The measure must also pursue a legitimate objective and loss of the home must be shown to be proportionate to the legitimate aims

pursued, in accordance with Article 8 § 2. Regard must therefore be had to the factual circumstances of the occupant whose legitimate interests are to be protected (*Orlić v. Croatia*, § 64; *Gladysheva v. Russia*, §§ 94-95; *Kryvitska and Kryvitskyy v. Ukraine*, § 50; *Andrey Medvedev v. Russia*, § 55).

329. The Court has thus decided that a *summary procedure* for eviction of a tenant that does not offer adequate procedural guarantees would entail a violation of the Convention, even if the measure was legitimately seeking to ensure due application of the statutory housing regulations (*McCann v. the United Kingdom*, § 55). Termination of a lease without any possibility of having the proportionality of the measure determined by an independent tribunal was held to infringe Article 8 (*Kay and Others v. the United Kingdom*, § 74). Furthermore, continuing occupation of a person's property in breach of an enforceable eviction order issued by a court after finding that the occupation in question was illegal infringes Article 8 (*Khamidov v. Russia*, § 145).

330. In its judgment *Larkos v. Cyprus* [GC], the Court held that offering differential protection to tenants against eviction – according to whether they are renting State-owned property or renting from private landlords – entailed a violation of Article 14 taken in conjunction with Article 8 (§§ 31-32). However, it is not discriminatory to make provisions only for tenants of publicly owned property to purchase their flat, with tenants of privately owned flats which they occupy being unable to do so (*Strunjak and Others v. Croatia* (dec.)). Moreover, it is legitimate to put in place criteria according to which *social housing* can be allocated, when there is insufficient supply available to satisfy demand, so long as such criteria are not arbitrary or discriminatory (*Bah v. the United Kingdom*, § 49; see, more generally, on tenants of social housing *Paulić v. Croatia*; *Kay and Others v. the United Kingdom*).

331. The Court did not find a violation of Article 8 regarding a reform of the housing sector, following the transition from a socialist regime to a market economy, resulting in a general weakening of legal protection for holders of “*specialty protected tenancies*”. Despite an increase in rent and a reduced guarantee of being able to stay in their flats, the tenants continued to enjoy special protection to a degree that was higher than that normally afforded to tenants (*Berger-Krall and Others v. Slovenia*, § 273 and the references cited therein; compare, however, *Galović v. Croatia* (dec.), § 65).

3. Tenants’ partners/unauthorised occupancy

332. The protection provided by Article 8 of the Convention is not confined to lawful/authorised occupancy of a building pursuant to domestic law (*McCann v. the United Kingdom*, § 46; *Bjedov v. Croatia*, § 58; *Ivanova and Cherkezov v. Bulgaria*, § 49). As a matter of fact, the Court extended the protection of Article 8 to the occupant of a flat to which only her partner held the tenancy rights (*Prokopovich v. Russia*, § 37; see also *Korelc v. Slovenia*, § 82), and to a person who had been living unlawfully in her flat for almost 40 years (*Brežec v. Croatia*, § 36). On the other hand, when considering whether a requirement that the individual leave his or her home is proportionate to the legitimate aim pursued, it is highly relevant whether or not the home was established unlawfully (*Chapman v. the United Kingdom* [GC], § 102).

333. The Court found a violation of Article 14 taken in conjunction with Article 8 where an occupant was prohibited from succeeding to a tenancy after the death of his same-sex partner (*Karner v. Austria*, §§ 41-43; *Kozak v. Poland*, § 99).

4. Minorities and vulnerable persons

334. The Court also takes into account an occupant’s vulnerability, with case-law protecting minorities’ lifestyles. It has, in particular, emphasised the vulnerability of Roma and Travellers, and the need to pay particular attention to their specific needs and ways of life (*Connors v. the United Kingdom*, § 84). That may impose positive obligations on the national authorities (*Chapman v. the United Kingdom* [GC], § 96; *Yordanova and Others v. Bulgaria*, §§ 129-130 and 133), albeit within

certain limits (*Codona v. the United Kingdom* (dec.)). Measures affecting the stationing of Gypsy caravans have an impact on their right to respect for their “home” (*Chapman v. the United Kingdom* [GC], § 73). Where problems arise, the Court places the emphasis on action by the national authorities to find a solution (*Stenegry and Adam v. France* (dec.)).

335. In that connection, the Court reiterated the criteria for assessing compliance with the requirements of Article 8 in its *Winterstein and Others v. France* judgment (§ 148 and the references therein). It found no violation where the applicants’ difficult situation was duly taken into account, the reasons relied on by the responsible planning authorities were relevant and sufficient and the means employed were not disproportionate (*Buckley v. the United Kingdom*, § 84; *Chapman v. the United Kingdom* [GC], § 114). As regards measures to remove persons from their living environment, the Court found a violation in the cases of *Connors v. the United Kingdom*, § 95; *Yordanova and Others v. Bulgaria*, § 144; *Winterstein and Others v. France*, §§ 156 and 167; *Buckland v. the United Kingdom*, § 70; *Bagdonavicius and Others v. Russia*, § 107 (concerning forced evictions and the destruction of houses without any rehousing plans).

336. The Court has also ruled that the authorities’ general attitude perpetuating the feelings of insecurity of Roma whose houses and property had been destroyed, and the repeated failure of the authorities to put a stop to interference with their home life, in particular, amounted to a serious violation of Article 8 (*Moldovan and Others v. Romania (no. 2)*, §§ 108-109).

337. A measure which affects a minority does not amount ipso facto to a violation of Article 8 (*Noack and Others v. Germany* (dec.)). In this case, the Court has considered whether the arguments put forward to justify transferring the residents of a municipality, some of whom belonged to a national minority, to another municipality were relevant, and whether that interference had been proportionate to the aim pursued, bearing in mind that it had affected a minority.

338. Individuals who lack legal capacity are also particularly vulnerable. Article 8 therefore imposes on the State the positive obligation to afford them special protection. Accordingly, the fact that a person who lacked legal capacity was dispossessed of her home without being able to participate effectively in the proceedings or to have the proportionality of the measure determined by the courts amounted to a violation of Article 8 (*Zehentner v. Austria*, §§ 63 and 65). Reference should be made to the safeguards existing in domestic law (*A.-M.V. v. Finland*, §§ 82-84 and 90). In the case cited, the Court found no violation of Article 8 on account of the refusal to comply with the wishes of an adult with intellectual disabilities regarding his education and place of residence.

339. The Court has held that the fact that children who had been psychologically affected by repeatedly witnessing their father’s violence against their mother in the family home amounted to an interference with their right to respect for their home (*Eremia v. the Republic of Moldova*, § 74). The Court found a violation of Article 8 in that case on the grounds of the failure of the judicial system to react decisively to the serious domestic violence committed (§§ 78-79).

340. A refusal by the welfare authorities to provide housing assistance to an individual suffering from a serious disease might in certain circumstances raise an issue under Article 8 because of the impact of such a refusal on the private life of the individual in question (*O’Rourke v. the United Kingdom* (dec.)).

341. In its case-law, the Court takes into account the relevant international-law material and determines the scope of the member States’ margin of appreciation (*A.-M.V. v. Finland*, §§ 73-74 and 90).

5. Home visits, searches and seizures

342. In order to secure physical evidence on certain offences, the domestic authorities may consider it necessary to implement measures which entail entering a private home. The actions of the police when entering homes must be proportionate to the aim pursued (*McLeod v. the United Kingdom*,

§§ 53-57), as must any action taken inside the individual home (*Vasylchuk v. Ukraine*, § 83, concerning the ransacking of private premises).

343. The judgment in the case of *National federation of Sportspersons' Associations and unions (FNASS) and Others v. France* concerned the obligation imposed on high-level athletes falling within a “target group” to give advance notification of their whereabouts so that unannounced anti-doping tests could be carried out. The Court emphasised that home visits for the purposes of such testing were very different from those carried out under court supervision, which were geared to investigating offences or seizing items of property. Such searches, by definition, struck at the heart of respect for the home and could not be treated as equivalent to the visits to the athletes’ homes (§ 186). The Court considered that reducing or cancelling the obligations of which the applicant had complained could increase the dangers of doping to their health and to that of the whole sporting community, and would run counter to the European and international consensus on the need to carry out unannounced tests (§ 190).

344. Citizens must be protected from the risk of undue police intrusions into their homes. The Court found a violation of Article 8 where members of a special intervention unit wearing balaclavas and armed with machine guns had entered a private home at daybreak in order to serve charges on the applicant and escort him to the police station. The Court pointed out that that safeguards should be in place in order to avoid any possible abuse and protect human dignity in such circumstances (*Kučera v. Slovakia*, §§ 119 and 122; see also *Rachwalski and Ferenc v. Poland*, § 73). Those safeguards might even include requiring the State to conduct an effective investigation if that is the only legal means of shedding light on allegations of unlawful searches of property (*H.M. v. Turkey*, §§ 26-27 and 29: violation of the procedural limb of Article 8 owing to the inadequacy of the investigation; regarding the importance of such procedural protection, see *Vasylchuk v. Ukraine*, § 84).

345. Measures involving entering private homes must be “in accordance with the law”, which entails compliance with legal procedure (*L.M. v. Italy*, §§ 29 and 31) and with the existing safeguards (*Panteleyenko v. Ukraine*, §§ 50-51; *Kilyen v. Romania*, § 34), must pursue one of the legitimate aims listed in Article 8 § 2 (*Smirnov v. Russia*, § 40), and must be “necessary in a democratic society” to achieve that aim (*Camenzind v. Switzerland*, § 47).

346. The following are examples of measures which pursue legitimate aims: action by the Competition Authority to protect economic competition (*DELTA PEKÁRNÝ a.s. v. the Czech Republic*, § 81); suppression of tax evasion (*Kessassy v. France* (dec.), and *K.S. and M.S. v. Germany*, § 48); seeking circumstantial and material evidence in criminal cases, for example involving forgery, breach of trust and the issuing of uncovered cheques (*Van Rossem v. Belgium*, § 40), drug trafficking (*Işıldak v. Turkey*, § 50), and illegal trade in medicines (*Wieser and Bicos Beteiligungen GmbH v. Austria*, § 55); and protecting health and the “rights and freedoms of others” in the context of combating doping in sport (*National federation of Sportspersons' Associations and unions (FNASS) and Others v. France*, §§ 165-166).

347. The Court also assesses the relevance and adequacy of the arguments advanced to justify such measures, and compliance with the proportionality principle in the specific circumstances of the case (*Buck v. Germany*, § 45), and whether the relevant legislation and practice provide appropriate and relevant safeguards to prevent the authorities from taking arbitrary action (*Gutsanovi v. Bulgaria*, § 220; regarding the applicable criteria, see *Iliya Stefanov v. Bulgaria*, §§ 38-39; *Smirnov v. Russia*, § 44). For example, judges cannot simply sign a record, add the official court seal and enter the date and time of the decision with the word “approved” on the document without a separate order setting out the grounds for such approval (*Gutsanovi v. Bulgaria*, § 223). Regarding a home search which was carried out under a warrant likely to have been obtained in breach of domestic and international law, see *K.S. and M.S. v. Germany*, §§ 49-53.

348. The Court is particularly vigilant where domestic law authorises house searches without a judicial warrant. It accepts such searches where the lack of a warrant is offset by effective subsequent judicial scrutiny of the lawfulness and necessity of the measure (*Işıldak v. Turkey*, § 51; *Gutsanovi v. Bulgaria*, § 222). This requires those concerned to be able to secure effective *de facto* and *de jure* judicial scrutiny of the lawfulness of the measure and appropriate redress should the measure be found unlawful (*DELTA PEKÁRNY a.s. v. the Czech Republic*, § 87). A house search ordered by a prosecutor without scrutiny by a judicial authority is in breach of Article 8 (*Varga v. Romania*, §§ 70-74).

349. The Court considers that a search warrant has to be accompanied by certain limitations, so that the interference which it authorises is not potentially unlimited and therefore disproportionate. The wording of the warrant must specify its scope (in order to ensure that the search concentrates solely on the offences under investigation) and the criteria for its enforcement (to facilitate scrutiny of the extent of the operations). A broadly worded warrant lacking information on the investigation in question or the items to be seized fails to strike a fair balance between the rights of the parties involved because of the wide powers which it confers on the investigators (*Van Rossem v. Belgium*, §§ 44-50 and the references therein; *Bagiyeva v. Ukraine*, § 52).

350. A police search may be deemed disproportionate where it has not been preceded by reasonable and available precautions (*Keegan v. the United Kingdom*, §§ 33-36: lack of adequate prior verification of the identities of the residents of the premises searched), or where the action taken was excessive (*Vasylichuk v. Ukraine*, §§ 80 and 84). A police raid at 6 a.m., without adequate reason, of the home of an absent person who was not the prosecuted person but the victim, was found not to have been “necessary” in a democratic society (*Zubaľ v. Slovakia*, §§ 41-45, where the Court also noted the impact on the reputation of the person concerned). The Court has also found a violation of Article 8 in a case of searches and seizures in a private home in connection with an offence purportedly committed, moreover, by another person (*Buck v. Germany*, § 52).

351. The Court may take into account the presence of the applicant and other witnesses during a house search (*Bagiyeva v. Ukraine*, § 53) as a factor enabling the applicant effectively to control the extent of the searches carried out (*Maslák and Micháľková v. the Czech Republic*, § 79). On the other hand, a search conducted in the presence of the person concerned, his lawyer, two other witnesses and an expert but in the absence of prior authorisation by a court and of effective subsequent scrutiny is insufficient to prevent the risk of abuse of authority by the investigating agencies (*Gutsanovi v. Bulgaria*, § 225).

352. Adequate and sufficient safeguards must also be in place when a search is carried out at such an early stage of the criminal proceedings as the preliminary police investigation preceding the pre-trial investigation (*Modestou v. Greece*, § 44). The Court found that a search at this stage had been disproportionate on account of the imprecise wording of the warrant, the lack of prior judicial scrutiny, the fact that the applicant had not been physically present during the search, and the lack of immediate retrospective judicial review (§§ 52-54).

353. Conversely, the safeguards established by domestic law and the practicalities of the search may lead to a finding of no violation of Article 8 (*Camenzind v. Switzerland*, § 46, and *Paulić v. Croatia* regarding a search of limited scope geared to seizing an unauthorised telephone; *Cronin v. the United Kingdom* (dec.) and *Ratushna v. Ukraine*, § 82, regarding the existence of appropriate safeguards).

354. As regards visits to homes and seizures by customs officers, the Court has deemed disproportionate the extensive powers conferred on the customs authorities combined with the lack of a judicial warrant (*Mialhe v. France (no. 1)*; *Funke v. France*; *Crémieux v. France*).

355. The Court considers the protection of citizens and institutions against the threats of terrorism and the specific problems bound up with the arrest and detention of persons suspected of

terrorist-linked offences when examining the compatibility of an interference with Article 8 § 2 of the Convention (*Murray v. the United Kingdom*, § 91; *H.E. v. Turkey*, §§ 48-49). Anti-terrorist legislation must provide adequate protection against abuse and be complied with by the authorities (*Khamidov v. Russia*, § 143). For an anti-terrorist operation, see also *Menteş and Others v. Turkey*, § 73.

356. In the case of *Sher and Others v. the United Kingdom*, the authorities had suspected an imminent terrorist attack and initiated extremely complex investigations in order to foil the attack. The Court agreed that the search warrant had been couched in fairly broad terms. However, it considered that the fight against terrorism and the urgency of the situation could justify a search based on terms that were wider than would otherwise have been permissible. In cases of this nature, the police should be permitted some flexibility in assessing, on the basis of what is encountered during the search, which items might be linked to terrorist activities, and in seizing them for further examination (§§ 174-176).

C. Commercial premises

357. The rights guaranteed by Article 8 of the Convention may include the right to respect for a company's registered office, branches or other business premises (*Société Colas Est and Others v. France*, § 41). In connection with an individual's premises which were also the headquarters of a company which he controlled, see *Chappell v. the United Kingdom*, § 63.

358. The margin of appreciation afforded to the State in assessing the necessity of an interference is wider where the search measure concerns legal entities rather than individuals (*DELTA PEKÁRNY a.s. v. the Czech Republic*, § 82; *Bernh Larsen Holding AS and Others v. Norway*, § 159).

359. House searches or visits to and seizures on business premises may comply with the requirements of Article 8 (*Keslassy v. France* (dec.); *Société Canal Plus and Others v. France*, §§ 55-57). Such measures are disproportionate to the legitimate aims pursued and therefore contrary to the rights protected by Article 8, where there are no "relevant and sufficient" reasons to justify them and no appropriate and sufficient safeguards against abuse (*Société Colas Est and Others v. France*, §§ 48-49).

360. As regards the extent of the tax authorities' powers of investigation regarding computer servers, for example, the Court has emphasised the public interest in ensuring efficiency in the inspection of information provided by applicant companies for tax assessment purposes and the importance of the existence of effective and adequate safeguards against abuse by the tax authorities (*Bernh Larsen Holding AS and Others v. Norway*, §§ 172-174, no violation).

361. As regards inspections of premises in the context of anti-competitive practices, the Court found a violation of Article 8 where no prior authorisation had been sought or given for an inspection by a judge, no effective ex post scrutiny had been conducted of the necessity of the interference, and no regulations existed on the possible destruction of the copies seized during the inspection (*DELTA PEKÁRNY a.s. v. the Czech Republic*, § 92).

D. Law firms

362. The concept of "home" in Article 8 § 1 of the Convention embraces not only a private individual's home but also a lawyer's office or a law firm (*Buck v. Germany*, §§ 31-32; *Niemietz v. Germany*, §§ 30-33). Searches of the premises of a lawyer may breach professional secrecy, which is the basis of the relationship of trust existing between a lawyer and his client (*André and Another v. France*, § 41). Consequently, such measures must be accompanied by "special procedural guarantees" and the lawyer must have access to "effective scrutiny" to contest them. That is not the case where a remedy fails to provide for the cancellation of the impugned search (*Xavier Da Silveira v. France*, §§ 37, 42 and 48).

363. In view of the impact of such measures, their adoption and implementation must be subject to very clear and precise rules (*Petri Sallinen and Others v. Finland*, § 90; *Wolland v. Norway*, § 62). The role played by lawyers in defending human rights is a further reason why searches of their premises should be subject to especially strict scrutiny (*Heino v. Finland*, § 43; *Kolesnichenko v. Russia*, § 31).

364. Such measures may concern offences which directly involve the lawyer or, on the contrary, have nothing to do with him or her. In some cases, the search in question was designed to obviate the difficulties encountered by the authorities in gathering incriminating evidence (*André and Another v. France*, § 47), in breach of legal professional secrecy (*Smirnov v. Russia*, §§ 46 and 49). The importance of legal professional secrecy has always been emphasised in relation to Article 6 of the Convention (rights of the defence) since *Niemietz v. Germany* (§ 37). The Court also refers to the protection of the lawyer's reputation (*ibid.*, § 37; *Buck v. Germany*, § 45).

365. The Convention does not prohibit the imposition on lawyers of certain obligations likely to concern their relationships with their clients. This is the case, in particular, where credible evidence is found of a lawyer's participation in an offence, or in connection with efforts to combat certain unlawful practices. The Court has emphasised that it is vital to provide a strict framework for such measures (*André and Another v. France*, § 42). For an example of a search conducted in a law firm in accordance with the requirements of the Convention, see *Jacquier v. France* (dec.) and *Wolland v. Norway*.

366. The fact that a visit to a home took place in the presence of the chairman of the Bar Association is a "special procedural guarantee" (*Roemen and Schmit v. Luxembourg*, § 69; *André and Another v. France*, §§ 42-43), but the presence of that chairman is insufficient on its own (*Ibid.*, §§ 44-46). The Court has found a violation on the grounds of the lack of a judicial warrant and of effective ex post judicial scrutiny (*Heino v. Finland*, § 45).

367. The existence of a search warrant providing relevant and sufficient reasons for issuing letters rogatory does not necessarily safeguard against all risks of abuse, because regard must also be had to its scope and the powers conferred on the inspectors. The Court has thus found a violation in cases of search warrants which were too broad in scope and conferred too much power on the investigators, and where no regard was had to the person's status as a lawyer and no action taken to properly protect his or her professional secrecy (*Kolesnichenko v. Russia*, §§ 32-35; *Iliya Stefanov v. Bulgaria*, §§ 39-44; *Smirnov v. Russia*, § 48; *Aleksanyan v. Russia*, § 216).

368. The Court has also taken issue with seizures and searches which, although accompanied by special procedural guarantees, were nonetheless disproportionate to the legitimate aim pursued (*Roemen and Schmit v. Luxembourg*, §§ 69-72). In assessing whether the extent of the interference was proportionate and therefore "necessary in a democratic society", the Court has taken into account the amount of documents that needed to be examined by the authorities, the time it took them to do so and the level of inconvenience the applicant had to suffer (*Wolland v. Norway*, § 80).

369. It should be noted that under Article 8 a search can raise issues from the angle of respect for "home", "correspondence" and "private life" (*Golovan v. Ukraine*, § 51 ; *Wolland v. Norway*, § 52).

E. Journalists' homes

370. Searches of press premises aimed at obtaining information on journalists' sources can raise an issue under Article 8 (and are therefore not liable solely to assessment under Article 10 of the Convention). Searches of lawyers' premises may be aimed at discovering journalists' sources (*Roemen and Schmit v. Luxembourg*, §§ 64-72).

371. The Court has considered disproportionate a series of searches conducted of journalists' professional and private premises, even though it acknowledged that they had afforded some procedural guarantees. As a matter of fact, the journalists had not been charged with any offences, and the search warrants had been couched in broad terms and had not included any information on

the investigation in question, the premises to be inspected and the items to be seized. Consequently, those warrants conferred too many powers on the investigators, who had thus been able to copy and seize extensive data. Moreover, the journalists had not been informed of the reasons for the searches (*Ernst and Others v. Belgium*, §§ 115-116).

372. The Court has assessed a search of the headquarters of a company which published a newspaper with a view to confirming the identity of the author of an article published in the press. It held that the fact that the journalists and the employees of the company had cooperated with the police did not make the search and the associated seizure any less intrusive. The competent authorities should show restraint in implementing such measures, having regard to the practical requirements of the case (*Saint-Paul Luxembourg S.A. v. Luxembourg*, §§ 38 and 44).

F. Home environment

1. General approach

373. The Convention does not explicitly secure the right to a healthy, calm environment (*Kyrtatos v. Greece*, § 52), but where an individual is directly and seriously affected by noise or other pollution, an issue may arise under Article 8 (*Hatton and Others v. the United Kingdom* [GC], § 96; *Moreno Gómez v. Spain*, § 53). Article 8 may be applicable whether the pollution is directly caused by the State or the latter is responsible in the absence of appropriate regulations governing the activities of the private sector in question.

374. However, in order to raise an issue under Article 8, the environmental pollution must have direct and immediate consequences for the right to respect for the home (*Hatton and Others v. the United Kingdom* [GC], § 96). For example, a reference to risks of pollution from a future industrial activity is insufficient in itself to confer victim status on an applicant (*Asselbourg and Others v. Luxembourg* (dec.)).

375. The consequences of the environmental pollution must reach a certain severity threshold, without necessarily seriously endangering the person's health (*López Ostra v. Spain*, § 51). Assessment of that threshold depends on the circumstances of the case, such as the intensity and duration of the nuisance (*Udovičić v. Croatia*, § 139), and its physical or mental effects (*Fadeyeva v. Russia*, § 69).

376. Consequently, Article 8 covers neither "general deterioration of the environment" (*Martínez Martínez and Pino Manzano v. Spain*, § 42) nor the case of detriment which is negligible in comparison to the environmental hazards inherent to life in every modern city (*Hardy and Maile v. the United Kingdom*, § 188).

377. The requisite severity threshold is not reached where a pulsating noise from wind turbines (*Fägerskiöld v. Sweden* (dec.)) or the noise emanating from a dentist's surgery (*Galev and Others v. Bulgaria* (dec.)) are insufficient to cause serious harm to residents and prevent them from enjoying the amenities of their home (see also, regarding a meat-processing plant, *Koceniak v. Poland* (dec.)). On the other hand, the noise level of letting off fireworks near homes in the countryside can reach the requisite severity threshold (*Zammit Maempel v. Malta*, § 38).

378. The mere fact that the activity causing the alleged nuisance is unlawful is insufficient in itself to bring it within the scope of Article 8. The Court must decide whether the nuisance reached the requisite severity threshold (*Furlepa v. Poland* (dec.)). The case of *Dzemyuk v. Ukraine* concerned a cemetery close to the applicant's house and water supply. The high level of bacteria found in the drinking water from the applicant's well, coupled with a blatant violation of environmental health safety regulations, confirmed the existence of environmental risks, in particular of serious water pollution, reaching a sufficient level of severity to trigger the application of Article 8. The unlawfulness of the siting of the cemetery had been recognised in various domestic court decisions,

but the competent local authorities had failed to comply with the final judicial decision ordering the closure of the cemetery. The Court ruled that the interference with the applicant’s right to respect for his home and his private and family life was not “in accordance with the law” (§§ 77-84 and 87-92).

379. The Court allows some flexibility in terms of proving the harmful effect of pollution on the right to respect for the home (*Fadeyeva v. Russia*, § 79). The fact that the applicant was unable to provide an official document from the domestic authorities certifying the danger does not necessarily make his application inadmissible (*Tătar v. Romania*, § 96).

380. When dealing with an allegation of environmental pollution affecting the right to the “home”, the Court adopts a two-stage approach. First of all, it considers the substantive merits of the domestic authorities’ decisions, and secondly, it scrutinises the decision-making process (*Hatton and Others v. the United Kingdom* [GC], § 99). The violation may involve an arbitrary interference by the public authorities or a failure to honour their positive obligations. The Court reiterates that in both contexts regard must be had to the fair balance that has to be struck between the competing interests of the individual and of the community as a whole (*Moreno Gómez v. Spain*, § 55).

381. The effective enjoyment of the right to respect for one’s home requires the State adopt all the reasonable and appropriate measures needed to protect individuals from serious damage to their environment (*Tătar v. Romania*, § 88). That presupposes putting in place a legislative and administrative framework to prevent such damage. The State has an extensive margin of appreciation in this sphere, because the Court does not recognise any special status of environmental human rights (*Hatton and Others v. the United Kingdom* [GC], §§ 100 and 122).

382. The State must strike a fair balance between the competing interests at stake (*Fadeyeva v. Russia*, § 93; *Hardy and Maile v. the United Kingdom*, § 218). In the sphere of noise pollution, the Court has accepted the argument concerning the economic interests of operating major international airports close to residential areas (*Powell and Rayner v. the United Kingdom*, § 42), including night flights (*Hatton and Others v. the United Kingdom* [GC], § 126). However, the Court found that such a fair balance had not been struck in a case where the authorities had failed to offer an effective solution involving moving residents away from the dangerous area surrounding a major steel plant or to take action to reduce the industrial pollution to acceptable levels (*Fadeyeva v. Russia*, § 133).

383. The Court takes into account the measures implemented by the domestic authorities. It found a violation of the right to respect for the home in the case of *López Ostra v. Spain*, §§ 56-58, where the authorities had impeded the closure of a plant treating hazardous wastewater. Local authority inertia *vis-à-vis* continuous noise pollution from a nightclub, where the noise exceeded permitted levels, led to a finding of a violation in *Moreno Gómez v. Spain*, § 61. The Court also found a violation of the right to respect for the home on account of the protracted inability of the Italian authorities to ensure the proper functioning of the waste collection, treatment and disposal service in *Di Sarno and Others v. Italy*, § 112).

384. The decision-making process must necessarily involve appropriate investigations and studies in order to assess the environmentally damaging effects of the impugned activities (*Hatton and Others v. the United Kingdom* [GC], § 128). In the case cited, however, the Court pointed out that that did not mean that the authorities could only take decisions if comprehensive and measurable data were available in relation to each and every aspect of the matter to be decided. The investigations must strike a fair balance between the competing interests at stake (*ibid.*).

385. The Court has emphasised the importance of public access to the findings of the investigations and studies conducted and to information enabling them to assess the danger to which the public are exposed (*Giacomelli v. Italy*, § 83). The Court accordingly criticised the fact that people living close to an extraction plant using sodium cyanide had not been allowed to take part in the

decision-making process. Unlike in *Hatton and Others v. the United Kingdom* [GC] (§ 120), the local residents had not had access to the conclusions of the study forming the basis for granting operational authorisation to the plant, and they had been provided with no other official information on the subject. The domestic provisions governing public debates had been flouted (*Tătar v. Romania*, §§ 115-124). In another case, however, the Court noted that the public had had access to the necessary information to identify and assess the hazards associated with the operation of two liquefied natural gas terminals (*Hardy and Maile v. the United Kingdom*, §§ 247-250).

386. All individuals should also be able to appeal to a court if they consider that their interests have not been sufficiently taken into consideration in the decision-making process (*Tătar v. Romania*, § 88). This presupposes that the authorities concerned must enforce final and binding decisions. The Court found a violation of Article 8 in a case where the local authorities had failed to enforce a final judicial decision to close a cemetery whose proximity to the applicant's home had caused bacteriological contamination of his water supply (*Dzemyuk v. Ukraine*, § 92).

387. The choice of the means of dealing with environmental issues is left to the discretion of the States, which are not required to implement any specific measure requested by individuals (in relation, for example, to protecting their health against particle emissions from motor vehicles: *Greenpeace e.V. and Others v. Germany* (dec.)). In such a complex sphere, Article 8 does not require the national authorities to ensure that every individual enjoys housing that meets particular environmental standards (*Grimkovskaya v. Ukraine*, § 65).

2. Noise disturbance, problems with neighbours and other nuisances

388. Where such nuisances go beyond the ordinary difficulties of living with neighbours (*Apanasewicz v. Poland*, § 98), they may affect peaceful enjoyment of one's home, whether they be caused by private individuals, business activities or public agencies (*Martínez Martínez v. Spain*, §§ 42 and 51). If the requisite severity threshold is reached, the domestic authorities, having been duly informed about the nuisances, have an obligation to take effective measures to ensure respect for the right to the peaceful enjoyment of the home (*Mileva and Others v. Bulgaria*, § 97, violation owing to a failure to prevent the unlawful operation of a computer club causing a nuisance in a block of flats). The Court also found a violation of Article 8 on the grounds of night-time disturbances caused by a discotheque (*Martínez Martínez v. Spain*, §§ 47-54 and the references therein) or a bar (*Udovičić v. Croatia*, § 159), or of the absence of an effective response by the authorities to complaints about serious and repetitive neighbourhood disturbances (*Surugiu v. Romania*, §§ 67-69). There is also a violation where the State has taken inadequate action to reduce excessive road traffic noise level in a home (*Deés v. Hungary*, §§ 21-24). Introducing a sanction system requiring the building of a noise barrier wall is not enough if the system is not applied in a timely and effective manner (*Bor v. Hungary*, § 27).

389. The Court examines the practical consequences of alleged nuisances and the situation as a whole (*Zammit Maempel v. Malte*, § 73, no violation). For example, it did not find any issue under Article 8 where the appropriate technical measurements had been omitted (*Oluić v. Croatia*, § 51), or where the applicants had not shown that they had sustained any specific damage from the impugned nuisance (*Borysiewicz v. Poland*, concerning a tailoring workshop; *Frankowski v. Poland* (dec.), concerning road traffic; *Chiş v. Romania* (dec.), concerning the operation of a bar). Nor is there a violation where the authorities have taken action to limit the impact of nuisances and there has been an adequate decision-making process (*Flamenbaum and Others v. France*, §§ 141-160; see also the reminder of the applicable general principles in §§ 133-138).

3. Pollutant and potentially dangerous activities

390. The resultant environmental hazards must have direct repercussions on the right to respect for the home and reach a minimum severity threshold. One case in point is serious water pollution

(*Dubetska and Others v. Ukraine*, §§ 110 and 113). Unsubstantiated fears and claims are insufficient (*Ivan Atanasov v. Bulgaria*, § 78; see also *Furlepa v. Poland* (dec.) regarding the operation of a car accessory shop and a car repair garage; *Walkuska v. Poland* (dec.) concerning a pig farm). Furthermore, applicants may be partly responsible for the impugned situation (*Martínez Martínez and Pino Manzano v. Spain*, §§ 48-50, no violation).

391. The Court has, in particular, found violations of Article 8 owing to shortcomings attributable to the authorities in cases involving the use of dangerous industrial procedures (*Tătar v. Romania*) and toxic emissions (*Fadeyeva v. Russia*), as well as the flooding of housing located downstream of a water, attributable to negligence on the part of the authorities (*Kolyadenko and Others v. Russia*). In *Giacomelli v. Italy*, the Court found a violation in the absence of a prior environmental-impact assessment and the failure to suspend the activities of a plant generating toxic emissions close to a residential area. On the other hand, it found no violation where the competent authorities had fulfilled their obligations to protect and inform residents (*Hardy and Maile v. the United Kingdom*). Sometimes the authorities have to take reasonable and adequate action, even in cases where they are not directly responsible for the pollution caused by a factory, if so required in order to protect the rights of individuals. For instance, pursuant to Article 8, domestic authorities must strike a fair balance between the economic interest of a municipality in maintaining the activities of its main job-provider – a factory discharging dangerous chemical substances into the atmosphere – and the residents' interest in protecting their homes (*Băcilă v. Romania*, §§ 66-72, violation).

V. Correspondence

A. General points

1. Scope of the concept of “correspondence”

392. The right to respect for “correspondence” within the meaning of Article 8 § 1 aims to protect the confidentiality of communications in a wide range of different situations. This concept obviously covers letters of a private or professional nature (*Niemietz v. Germany*, § 32 *in fine*), including where the sender or recipient is a prisoner (*Silver and Others v. the United Kingdom*, § 84; *Mehmet Nuri Özen and Others v. Turkey*, § 41), but also packages seized by customs officers (*X v. the United Kingdom*, Commission decision). It also covers telephone conversations between family members (*Margareta and Roger Andersson v. Sweden*, § 72), or with others (*Lüdi v. Switzerland*, §§ 38-39; *Klass and Others v. Germany*, §§ 21 and 41; *Malone v. the United Kingdom*, § 64), telephone calls from private or business premises (*Amann v. Switzerland* [GC], § 44; *Halford v. the United Kingdom*, §§ 44-46; *Copland v. the United Kingdom*, § 41; *Kopp v. Switzerland*, § 50) and from a prison (*Petrov v. Bulgaria*, § 51), and the “interception” of information relating to such conversations (date, duration, numbers dialled) (*P.G. and J.H. v. the United Kingdom*, § 42).

393. *New technologies* also come within the scope of Article 8, in particular electronic messages (emails) (*Copland v. the United Kingdom*, § 41; *Bărbulescu v. Romania* [GC], no. 61496/08, § 72, ECHR 2017 (extracts)), Internet use (*Copland v. the United Kingdom*, §§ 41-42), and data stored on computer servers (*Wieser and Bicos Beteiligungen GmbH v. Austria*, § 45), including hard drives (*Petri Sallinen and Others v. Finland*, § 71) and floppy disks (*Iliya Stefanov v. Bulgaria*, § 42).

394. Older forms of electronic communication are likewise concerned, such as telexes (*Christie v. the United Kingdom*, Commission decision), pager messages (*Taylor-Sabori v. the United Kingdom*), and private radio broadcasting (*X and Y v. Belgium*, Commission decision), not including broadcasts on a public wavelength that are thus accessible to others (*B.C. v. Switzerland*, Commission decision).

Examples of “interference”

395. The content and form of the correspondence is irrelevant to the question of interference (*A. v. France*, §§ 35-37; *Frérot v. France*, § 54). For instance, opening and reading a folded piece of paper on which a lawyer had written a message and handed it to his clients is considered an “interference” (*Laurent v. France*, § 36). There is no *de minimis* principle for interference to occur: opening one letter is enough (*Narinen v. Finland*, § 32; *Idalov v. Russia* [GC], § 197).

396. All forms of censorship, interception, monitoring, seizure and other hindrances come within the scope of Article 8. Impeding someone from even initiating correspondence constitutes the most far-reaching form of “interference” with the exercise of the “right to respect for correspondence” (*Golder v. the United Kingdom*, § 43).

397. Other forms of interference with the right to respect for correspondence may include the following acts attributable to the public authorities:

- screening of correspondence (*Campbell v. the United Kingdom*, § 33), the making of copies (*Foxley v. the United Kingdom*, § 30) or the deletion of certain passages (*Pfeifer and Plankl v. Austria*, § 43);
- interception by various means and recording of personal or business-related conversations (*Amann v. Switzerland* [GC], § 45), for example by means of telephone tapping (*Malone v. the United Kingdom*, § 64, and, as regards metering, §§ 83-84; see also *P.G. and J.H. v. the United Kingdom*, § 42), even when carried out on the line of a third party (*Lambert v. France*, § 21); and

- storage of intercepted data concerning telephone, email and Internet use (*Copland v. the United Kingdom*, § 44).

The mere fact that such data may be obtained legitimately, for example from telephone bills, is no bar to finding an “interference”; the fact that the information has not been disclosed to third parties or used in disciplinary or other proceedings against the person concerned is likewise immaterial (*Ibid.*, § 43).

This may also concern:

- the forwarding of mail to a third party (*Luordo v. Italy*, §§ 72 and 75, with regard to a trustee in bankruptcy; *Herczegfalvy v. Austria*, §§ 87-88, with regard to the guardian of a psychiatric detainee);
- the copying of electronic files, including those belonging to companies (*Bernh Larsen Holding AS and Others v. Norway*, § 106);
- the copying of documents containing banking data and their subsequent storage by the authorities (*M.N. and Others v. San Marino*, § 52); and
- secret surveillance measures (*Kennedy v. the United Kingdom*, §§ 122-124; *Roman Zakharov v. Russia* [GC] and the references cited therein; *Centrum För Rättvisa v. Sweden**).

398. A “crucial contribution” by the authorities to a recording made by a private individual amounts to interference by a “public authority” (*A. v. France*, § 36; *Van Vondel v. the Netherlands*, § 49; *M.M. v. the Netherlands*, § 39, concerning a recording by a private individual with the prior permission of the public prosecutor).

2. Positive obligations

399. To date, the Court has identified several positive obligations for States in connection with the right to respect for correspondence, for instance:

- the State’s positive obligation when it comes to communications of a non-professional nature in the workplace (*Bărbulescu v. Romania* [GC], §§ 113 and 115-120).
- an obligation to prevent disclosure into the public domain of private conversations (*Craxi v. Italy (no 2)*, §§ 68-76);
- an obligation to provide prisoners with the necessary materials to correspond with the Court in Strasbourg (*Coteț v. Romania*, §§ 60-65; *Gagiu v. Romania*, §§ 91-92);
- an obligation to execute a Constitutional Court judgment ordering the destruction of audio cassettes containing recordings of telephone conversations between a lawyer and his client (*Chadimová v. the Czech Republic*, § 146); and
- an obligation to strike a fair balance between the right to respect for correspondence and the right to freedom of expression (*Benediktsdóttir v. Iceland* (dec.)).
- an obligation to provide an effective and accessible procedure enabling applicants holding public-sector posts to have access to any important information concerning them, even if the file is classified (*Yonchev v. Bulgaria*, §§ 49-53).

3. General approach

400. The situation complained of may fall within the scope of Article 8 § 1 both from the standpoint of respect for correspondence and from that of the other spheres protected by Article 8 (right to respect for the home, private life and family life) (*Chadimová v. the Czech Republic*, § 143 and the references cited therein).

401. An interference can only be justified if the conditions set out in the second paragraph of Article 8 are satisfied. Thus, if it is not to contravene Article 8, the interference must be “in accordance with the law”, pursue one or more “legitimate aims” and be “necessary in a democratic society” in order to achieve them.

402. The concept of “law” in Article 8 § 2 covers common-law and “continental” countries alike (*Kruslin v. France*, § 29). Where the Court considers that an interference is not “in accordance with the law”, it will generally refrain from reviewing whether the other requirements of Article 8 § 2 have been complied with (*Messina v. Italy (no. 2)*, § 83; *Enea v. Italy* [GC], § 144; *Meimanis v. Latvia*, § 66).

403. The Court affords the Contracting States a margin of appreciation under Article 8 in regulating matters in this sphere, but this margin remains subject to the Court’s review of compliance with the Convention (*Szuluk v. the United Kingdom*, § 45 and the references cited therein).

404. The Court has emphasised the importance of the relevant international instruments in this field, including the European Prison Rules (*Nusret Kaya and Others v. Turkey*, §§ 26-28 and 55).

B. Prisoners’ correspondence⁷

1. General principles

405. Some measure of control over prisoners’ correspondence is acceptable and is not of itself incompatible with the Convention, regard being paid to the ordinary and reasonable requirements of imprisonment (*Silver and Others v. the United Kingdom*, § 98; *Golder v. the United Kingdom*, § 45). However, such control must not exceed what is required by the legitimate aim pursued in accordance with Article 8 § 2 of the Convention. While it may be necessary to monitor detainees’ contact with the outside world, including telephone contact, the rules applied must afford the prisoner appropriate protection against arbitrary interference by the national authorities (*Doerga v. the Netherlands*, § 53).

406. The opening (*Demirtepe v. France*, § 26), monitoring (*Kornakovs v. Latvia*, § 158) and seizure (*Birznieks v. Latvia*, § 124) of a prisoner’s correspondence with the Court fall under Article 8. So too may the refusal to provide a prisoner with the materials needed for correspondence with the Court (*Cotleț v. Romania*, § 65).

407. In assessing the permissible extent of such control, it should be borne in mind that the opportunity to write and to receive letters is sometimes the prisoner’s only link with the outside world (*Campbell v. the United Kingdom*, § 45). General, systematic monitoring of the entirety of prisoners’ correspondence, without any rules as to the implementation of such a practice and without any reasons being given by the authorities, would breach the Convention (*Petrov v. Bulgaria*, § 44).

408. Examples of “interference” within the meaning of Article 8 § 1 include:

- interception by the prison authorities of a letter (*McCallum v. the United Kingdom*, § 31) or failure to post a letter (*William Faulkner v. the United Kingdom*, § 11; *Mehmet Nuri Özen and Others v. Turkey*, § 42);
- restrictions on (*Campbell and Fell v. the United Kingdom*, § 110) or the destruction of mail (*Fazil Ahmet Tamer v. Turkey*, §§ 52 and 54 for a filtering system);
- opening of a letter (*Narinen v. Finland*, § 32) – including where there are operational defects within the prison mail service (*Demirtepe v. France*, § 26) or the mail is simply

7. See also the chapter on Article 34 (individual applications)

opened before being handed over straight away (*Faulkner v. the United Kingdom* (dec.)); and;

- delays in delivering mail (*Cotleț v. Romania*, § 34) or a refusal to forward emails sent to the prisoner's address to a particular prisoner (*Helander v. Finland* (dec.), § 48).

Exchanges between two prisoners are also covered (*Pfeifer and Plankl v. Austria*, § 43), as is the refusal to hand over a book to a prisoner (*Ospina Vargas v. Italy*, § 44).

409. "Interference" may also result from:

- deleting certain passages (*Fazıl Ahmet Tamer v. Turkey*, §§ 10 and 53; *Pfeifer and Plankl v. Austria*, § 47);
- limiting the number of parcels and packets a prisoner is allowed to receive (*Aliiev v. Ukraine*, § 180); and
- recording and storing a prisoner's telephone conversations (*Doerga v. the Netherlands*, § 43) or conversations between a prisoner and his relatives during visits (*Wisse v. France*, § 29).

The same applies to the imposition of a disciplinary penalty entailing an absolute ban on sending or receiving mail for 28 days (*McCallum v. the United Kingdom*, § 31) and to a restriction concerning prisoners' use of their mother tongue during telephone conversations (*Nusret Kaya and Others v. Turkey*, § 36).

410. The interference must satisfy the requirements of lawfulness set forth in Article 8 § 2. The law must be sufficiently clear in its terms to give everyone an indication as to the circumstances in which and the conditions on which public authorities are empowered to resort to such measures (*Lavents v. Latvia*, § 135). It is for the respondent Government before the Court to indicate the statutory provision on which the national authorities based their monitoring of the prisoner's correspondence (*Di Giovine v. Italy*, § 25).

411. The lawfulness requirement refers not only to the existence of a legal basis in domestic law but also to the quality of the law, which should be clear, foreseeable as to its effects and accessible to the person concerned, who must be in a position to foresee the consequences of his or her acts (*Silver and Others v. the United Kingdom*, § 88).

412. Legislation is incompatible with the Convention if it does not regulate either the duration of measures to monitor prisoners' correspondence or the reasons that may justify them, if it does not indicate with sufficient clarity the scope and manner of exercise of the discretion conferred on the authorities in the relevant sphere, or if it leaves them too wide a margin of appreciation (*Labita v. Italy* [GC], §§ 176 and 180-184; *Niedbała v. Poland*, §§ 81-82; *Lavents v. Latvia*, § 136).

413. The following measures, among others, are not "in accordance with the law":

- censorship carried out in breach of provisions expressly prohibiting it (*Idalov v. Russia* [GC], § 201) or in the absence of provisions authorising it (*Demirtepe v. France*, § 27), or by an authority exceeding its powers under the applicable legislation (*Labita v. Italy* [GC], § 182);
- censorship on the basis of an unpublished instrument not accessible to the public (*Poltoratskiy v. Ukraine*, §§ 158-160);
- rules on the monitoring of prisoners' telephone calls that are not sufficiently clear and detailed to afford the applicant appropriate protection (*Doerga v. the Netherlands*, § 53).

414. The Court has also found a violation of Article 8 on account of the refusal to pass on a letter from one prisoner to another, on the basis of an internal instruction without any binding force (*Frérot v. France*, § 59).

415. Where domestic law allows interference, it must include safeguards to prevent abuses of power by the prison authorities. A law that simply identifies the category of persons whose correspondence “may be censored” and the competent court, without saying anything about the length of the measure or the reasons that may warrant it, is not sufficient (*Calogero Diana v. Italy*, §§ 32-33).

416. The Court finds a violation where the domestic provisions concerning the monitoring of prisoners’ correspondence leave the national authorities too much latitude and give prison governors the power to keep any correspondence “unsuited to the process of rehabilitating a prisoner”, with the result that “monitoring of correspondence therefore seems to be automatic, independent of any decision by a judicial authority and unappealable” (*Petra v. Romania*, § 37). However, although a law which confers a discretion must indicate the scope of that discretion (*Domenichini v. Italy*, § 32), the Court accepts that it is impossible to attain absolute certainty in the framing of the law (*Calogero Diana v. Italy*, § 32).

417. Amendments to an impugned law do not serve to redress violations which occurred before they entered into force (*Enea v. Italy* [GC], § 147; *Argenti v. Italy*, § 38).

418. Interference with a prisoner’s right to respect for his or her correspondence must also be necessary in a democratic society (*Yefimenko v. Russia*, § 142). Such “necessity” must be assessed with regard to the ordinary and reasonable requirements of imprisonment. The “prevention of disorder or crime” (*Kwiek v. Poland*, § 47; *Jankauskas v. Lithuania*, § 21), in particular, may justify more extensive interference in the case of a prisoner than for a person at liberty. Thus, to this extent, but to this extent only, lawful deprivation of liberty within the meaning of Article 5 will impinge on the application of Article 8 to persons deprived of their liberty (*Golder v. the United Kingdom*, § 45). In any event, the measure in question must be proportionate within the meaning of Article 8 § 2. The extent of the monitoring and the existence of adequate safeguards against abuse are fundamental criteria in this assessment (*Tsonyo Tsonev v. Bulgaria*, § 42).

419. The nature of the correspondence subject to monitoring may also be taken into consideration. Certain types of correspondence, for example with a lawyer, should enjoy an enhanced level of confidentiality, especially where it contains complaints against the prison authorities (*Yefimenko v. Russia*, § 144). As regards the extent and nature of the interference, monitoring of the entirety of a prisoner’s correspondence, without any distinction between different types of correspondent, upsets the balance between the interests at stake (*Petrov v. Bulgaria*, § 44). The mere fear of the prisoner evading trial or influencing witnesses cannot in itself justify an open licence for routine checking of all of a prisoner’s correspondence (*Jankauskas v. Lithuania*, § 22).

420. The interception of private letters because they contained “material deliberately calculated to hold the prison authorities up to contempt” was found not to have been “necessary in a democratic society” in the case of *Silver and Others v. the United Kingdom* (§§ 64, 91 and 99).

421. Furthermore, it is important to distinguish between minors placed under educational supervision and prisoners when assessing restrictions on correspondence and telephone communications. The authorities’ margin of appreciation is narrower in the former case (*D.L. v. Bulgaria*, §§ 104-109).

2. Where interference with prisoners’ correspondence may be necessary

422. Since the *Silver and Others v. the United Kingdom* judgment, the Court’s case-law has acknowledged that some measure of control over prisoners’ correspondence is called for and is not of itself incompatible with the Convention. The Court has held in particular that:

- the monitoring of prisoners’ correspondence may be legitimate on the grounds of maintaining order in prisons (*Kepeneklioğlu v. Turkey*, § 31; *Silver and Others v. the United Kingdom*, § 101);

- some measure of control – as opposed to automatic, routine interference – aimed at preventing disorder or crime may be justified, for example in the case of correspondence with dangerous individuals or concerning non-legal matters (*Jankauskas v. Lithuania*, §§ 21-22; *Faulkner v. the United Kingdom* (dec.));
- where access to a telephone is permitted, it may – having regard to the ordinary and reasonable conditions of prison life – be subjected to legitimate restrictions, for example in the light of the need for the facilities to be shared with other prisoners and the requirements of the prevention of disorder and crime (*A.B. v. the Netherlands*, § 93; *Coşcodar v. Romania* (dec.), § 30);
- a prohibition on sending a letter not written on an official form does not raise an issue, provided that such forms are readily available (*Faulkner v. the United Kingdom* (dec.));
- a prohibition on a foreign prisoner sending a letter to his relatives in a language not understood by the prison authorities does not raise an issue where the applicant did not give a convincing reason for declining the offer of a translation free of charge and was allowed to send two other letters (*Chishti v. Portugal* (dec.));
- limiting the number of packages and parcels may be justified to safeguard prison security and avoid logistical problems, provided that a balance is maintained between the interests at stake (*Aliev v. Ukraine*, §§ 181-182);
- a minor disciplinary penalty of withholding a parcel sent to a prisoner – for breaching the requirement to send correspondence via the prison authorities – was not found to be disproportionate (*Puzinas v. Lithuania (no. 2)*, § 34; compare, however, with *Buglov v. Ukraine*, § 137);
- a delay of three weeks in posting a non-urgent letter because of the need to seek instructions from a superior official was likewise not found to constitute a violation (*Silver and Others v. the United Kingdom*, § 104).

3. Written correspondence

423. Article 8 does not guarantee prisoners the right to choose the materials to write with. The requirement for prisoners to use official prison paper for their correspondence does not amount to interference with their right to respect for their correspondence, provided that the paper is immediately available (*Cotleţ v. Romania*, § 61).

424. Article 8 does not require States to pay the postage costs of all correspondence sent by prisoners (*Boyle and Rice v. the United Kingdom*, §§ 56-58). However, this matter should be assessed on a case-by-case basis as an issue could arise if a prisoner's correspondence was seriously hindered for lack of financial resources. Thus, the Court has held that:

- the refusal by the prison authorities to provide an applicant lacking the financial resources to buy such materials with the envelopes, stamps and writing paper needed for correspondence with the Court in Strasbourg may constitute a failure by the respondent State to comply with its positive obligation to ensure effective respect for the right to respect for correspondence (*Cotleţ v. Romania*, §§ 59 and 65);
- in the case of a prisoner without any means or any support who is entirely dependent on the prison authorities, those authorities must provide him with the necessary material, in particular stamps, for his correspondence with the Court (*Gagiu v. Romania*, §§ 91-92).

425. An interference with the right to correspondence that is found to have occurred *by accident* as a result of a mistake on the part of the prison authorities and is followed by an explicit acknowledgement and sufficient redress (for example, the adoption by the authorities of measures

ensuring that the mistake will not be repeated) does not raise an issue under the Convention (*Armstrong v. the United Kingdom* (dec.); *Tsonyo Tsonev v. Bulgaria*, § 29).

426. Proof of actual receipt of mail by the prisoner is the State's responsibility; in the event of a disagreement between the applicant and the respondent Government before the Court as to whether a letter was actually handed over, the Government cannot simply produce a record of incoming mail addressed to the prisoner, without ascertaining that the item in question did in fact reach its addressee (*Messina v. Italy*, § 31).

427. The authorities responsible for posting outgoing letters and receiving incoming mail should inform prisoners of any problems in the postal service (*Grace v. the United Kingdom*, Commission report, § 97).

4. Telephone conversations

428. Article 8 of the Convention does not confer on prisoners the right to make telephone calls, in particular where the facilities for communication by letter are available and adequate (*A.B. v. the Netherlands*, § 92; *Ciszewski v. Poland* (dec.)). However, where domestic law allows prisoners to speak by telephone, for example to their relatives, under the supervision of the prison authorities, a restriction imposed on their telephone communications may amount to "interference" with the exercise of their right to respect for their correspondence within the meaning of Article 8 § 1 of the Convention (*Nusret Kaya and Others v. Turkey*, § 36). In practice, consideration should be given to the fact that prisoners have to share a limited number of telephones and that the authorities have to prevent disorder and crime (*Daniliuc v. Romania* (dec.); see also *Davison v. the United Kingdom* (dec.)), as regards the charges for telephone calls made from prison).

429. Prohibiting a prisoner from using the prison telephone booth for a certain period to call his partner of four years, with whom he had a child, on the grounds that they were not married was found to breach Articles 8 and 14 taken together (*Petrov v. Bulgaria*, § 54).

430. In a high-security prison, the storage of the numbers that a prisoner wished to call – a measure of which he had been notified – was considered necessary for security reasons and to avoid the commission of further offences (the prisoner had other ways of remaining in contact with his relatives, such as letters and visits) (*Coşcodar v. Romania* (dec.), § 30).

5. Correspondence between prisoners and their lawyer

431. Article 8 applies indiscriminately to correspondence with a lawyer who has already been instructed by a client and a potential lawyer (*Schönenberger and Durmaz v. Switzerland*, § 29).

432. Correspondence between prisoners and their lawyer is "privileged under Article 8 of the Convention" (*Campbell v. the United Kingdom*, § 48; *Piechowicz v. Poland*, § 239). It may constitute a preliminary step to the exercise of the right of appeal, for example in respect of treatment during detention (*Ekinici and Akalin v. Turkey*, § 47), and may have a bearing on the preparation of a defence, in other words the exercise of another Convention right set forth in Article 6 (*Golder v. the United Kingdom*, § 45 *in fine*).

433. The Court considers observance of the principle of lawyer-client confidentiality to be fundamental (*Helander v. Finland* (dec.), § 53). Systematic monitoring of such correspondence sits ill with this principle (*Petrov v. Bulgaria*, § 43).

434. The Court accepts, however, that the prison authorities may open a letter from a lawyer to a prisoner when they have reasonable cause to believe that it contains an illicit enclosure which the normal means of detection have failed to disclose. The letter should, however, only be opened and should not be read (*Campbell v. the United Kingdom*, § 48; *Erdem v. Germany*, § 61). The protection of the prisoner's correspondence with the lawyer requires the member States to provide suitable

guarantees preventing the reading of the letter such as opening the letter in the presence of the prisoner (*Campbell v. the United Kingdom*, § 48).

435. The reading of a prisoner’s mail to and from a lawyer should only be permitted in exceptional circumstances when the authorities have reasonable cause to believe that the “privilege is being abused” in that the contents of the letter endanger prison security or the safety of others or are otherwise of a criminal nature. What may be regarded as “reasonable cause” will depend on all the circumstances but it presupposes the existence of facts or information which would satisfy an objective observer that the privileged channel of communication is being abused (*Campbell v. the United Kingdom*, § 48; *Petrov v. Bulgaria*, § 43). Any exceptions to this privilege must be accompanied by adequate and sufficient safeguards against abuse (*Erdem v. Germany*, § 65).

436. The prevention of terrorism is an exceptional context and involves pursuing the legitimate aims of protecting “national security” and preventing “disorder or crime” (*Erdem v. Germany*, §§ 60 and 66-69). In the case cited, the context of the ongoing trial, the terrorist threat, security requirements, the procedural safeguards in place and the existence of another channel of communication between the accused and his lawyer led the Court to find no violation of Article 8.

437. The interception of letters complaining of prison conditions and certain actions by the prison authorities was found not to comply with Article 8 § 2 (*Ekinci and Akalin v. Turkey*, § 47).

438. The withholding by the public prosecutor of a letter from a lawyer informing an arrested person of his rights was held to breach Article 8 § 2 (*Schönenberger and Durmaz v. Switzerland*, §§ 28-29).

439. Article 34 of the Convention (see below) may also be applicable in the case of a restriction of correspondence between a prisoner and a lawyer concerning an application to the Court and participation in proceedings before it (*Shtukaturov v. Russia*, § 140, concerning in particular a ban on telephone calls and correspondence). Yet, correspondence between an actual or prospective applicant and his or her representative before the Court should be privileged (*Boris Popov v. Russia*, §§ 43 and 112).

440. The Court has nevertheless specified that the State retains a certain margin of appreciation in determining the means of correspondence to which prisoners must have access. Thus, the refusal by the prison authorities to forward to a prisoner an email sent by his lawyer to the prison email address is justified where other effective and sufficient means of transmitting correspondence exist (*Helander v. Finland* (dec.), § 54, where domestic law provided that contact between prisoners and their lawyers had to take place by post, telephone or visits).

6. Correspondence with the Court

441. A prisoner’s correspondence with the Convention institutions falls within the scope of Article 8. The Court has found that there was interference with the right to respect for correspondence where letters sent to prisoners by the Convention institutions had been opened (*Peers v. Greece*, § 81; *Valašinas v. Lithuania*, §§ 128-129; *Idalov v. Russia* [GC], §§ 197-201). As in other cases, such interference will breach Article 8 unless it is “in accordance with the law”, pursued one of the legitimate aims set forth in Article 8 § 2 and was “necessary in a democratic society” in order to achieve that aim (*Petra v. Romania*, § 36).

442. In a specific case where only one of a significant number of letters had been “opened by mistake” at a facility to which the applicant had just been transferred, the Court found that there was no evidence of any deliberate intention on the authorities’ part to undermine respect for the applicant’s correspondence with the Convention institutions such as to constitute interference with his right to respect for his correspondence within the meaning of Article 8 § 1 (*Touroude v. France* (dec.); *Sayoud v. France* (dec.)).

443. On the other hand, where monitoring of correspondence is automatic, unconditional, independent of any decision by a judicial authority and unappealable, it is not “in accordance with the law” (*Petra v. Romania*, § 37; *Kornakovs v. Latvia*, § 159).

444. Disputes concerning correspondence between prisoners and the Court may also raise an issue under Article 34 of the Convention where there is hindrance of the “effective exercise” of the right of individual petition (*Shekhov v. Russia*, § 53 and the references cited therein; *Yefimenko v. Russia*, § 164).

445. The Contracting Parties to the Convention have undertaken to ensure that their authorities do not hinder “in any way” the effective exercise of the right to apply to the Court. It is therefore of the utmost importance that applicants or potential applicants are able to communicate freely with the Court without being dissuaded or discouraged by the authorities from pursuing a Convention remedy and without being subjected to any form of pressure to withdraw or modify their complaints (*Ilaşcu and Others v. Moldova and Russia* [GC], § 480; *Cotleş v. Romania*, § 69). Refusing to forward correspondence from an applicant that serves in principle to determine the issue of compliance with the six-month rule for the purposes of Article 35 § 1 of the Convention is a typical example of hindrance of the effective exercise of the right of application to the Court (*Kornakovs v. Latvia*, § 166). Situations falling under Article 34 of the Convention include the following:

- interception by the prison authorities of letters from or to the Court (*Maksym v. Poland*, §§ 31-33 and the references cited therein), even involving simple acknowledgments of receipt (*Yefimenko v. Russia*, § 163);
- imposition of a punishment on a prisoner for sending a letter to the Court (*Kornakovs v. Latvia*, §§ 168-169);
- acts constituting pressure or intimidation (*Ilaşcu and Others v. Moldova and Russia* [GC], § 481);
- refusal by the prison authorities to supply photocopies needing to be appended to the application form, or unjustified delays in doing so (*Igor Dmitrijevs v. Latvia*, §§ 91 and 100; *Gagiu v. Romania*, §§ 95-96; *Moisejevs v. Latvia*, § 184);
- in general, the lack of effective access to documents required for an application to the Court (*Vasiliy Ivashchenko v. Ukraine*, §§ 123 and 125).

446. It should be borne in mind that since they are confined within an enclosed space, have little contact with their relatives or the outside world and are constantly subject to the authority of the prison management, prisoners are undoubtedly in a position of vulnerability and dependence (*Cotleş v. Romania*, § 71; *Kornakovs v. Latvia*, § 164). Accordingly, as well as the undertaking to refrain from hindering the exercise of the right of petition, the authorities may in certain circumstances have an obligation to furnish the necessary facilities to a prisoner who is in a position of particular vulnerability and dependence *vis-à-vis* the prison management (*Naydyon v. Ukraine*, § 64) and is unable to obtain by his own means the documents required by the Registry of the Court in order to submit a valid application (*Vasiliy Ivashchenko v. Ukraine*, §§ 103-107).

447. In accordance with Rule 47 of the *Rules of Court*, the application form must be accompanied by relevant documents enabling the Court to reach its decision. In these circumstances, the authorities have an obligation to provide applicants, on request, with the documents they need in order for the Court to carry out an adequate and effective examination of their application (*Naydyon v. Ukraine*, § 63 and the references cited therein). Failure to provide the applicant in good time with the documents needed for the application to the Court entails a breach by the State of its obligation under Article 34 of the Convention (*Iambor v. Romania (no. 1)*, § 216; and contrast *Ustyantsev v. Ukraine*, § 99). It should nevertheless be pointed out that:

- as the Court has emphasised, there is no automatic right to receive copies of all documents from the prison authorities (*Chaykovskiy v. Ukraine*, §§ 94-97);
- not all delays in posting mail to the Court are worthy of criticism (for 4 to 5 days: *Yefimenko v. Russia*, §§ 131 and 159; for 6 days: *Shchebetov v. Russia*, § 84), particularly where there is no deliberate intention to hinder the applicant's complaint to the Court (for a slightly longer delay: *Valašinas v. Lithuania*, § 134), but the authorities have an obligation to forward correspondence without undue delay (*Sevastyanov v. Russia*, § 86);
- allegations by an applicant of hindrance of correspondence with the Court must be sufficiently substantiated (*Valašinas v. Lithuania*, § 136; *Michael Edward Cooke v. Austria*, § 48) and must attain a minimum level of severity to qualify as acts or omissions in breach of Article 34 of the Convention (*Kornakovs v. Latvia*, § 173; *Moisejevs v. Latvia*, § 186);
- the respondent Government must provide the Court with a reasonable explanation in response to consistent and credible allegations of a hindrance of the right of petition (*Klyakhin v. Russia*, §§ 120-121);
- the possibility of envelopes from the Court being forged in order to smuggle prohibited material into the prison constitutes such a negligible risk as to be discounted (*Peers v. Greece*, § 84).

7. Correspondence with journalists

448. The right to freedom of expression in the context of correspondence is protected by Article 8 of the Convention. In principle, a prisoner may send material for publication (*Silver and Others v. the United Kingdom*, § 99; *Fazil Ahmet Tamer v. Turkey*, § 53). In practice, the content of the material is a factor to be taken into consideration.

449. For example, an order prohibiting a remand prisoner from sending two letters to journalists was found to constitute interference. However, the national authorities had noted that they contained defamatory allegations against witnesses and the prosecuting authorities while the criminal proceedings were in progress. Moreover, the applicant had had the opportunity to raise those allegations in the courts and had not been deprived of contact with the outside world. The prohibition of his correspondence with the press was therefore found by the Court to have been proportionate to the legitimate aim pursued, namely the prevention of crime (*Jöcks v. Germany* (dec.)).

450. More broadly, in the case of a letter that has not been sent to the press but is liable to be published, the protection of the rights of the prison staff named in the letter may be taken into consideration (*W. v. the United Kingdom*, §§ 52-57).

8. Correspondence between a prisoner and a doctor

451. The Court dealt for the first time with the monitoring of a prisoner's medical correspondence in the case of *Szuluk v. the United Kingdom*. The case concerned the monitoring by the prison medical officer of the prisoner's correspondence with the specialist supervising his treatment in hospital, relating to his life-threatening medical condition. The Court accepted that a prisoner with a life-threatening medical condition would want to be reassured by an outside specialist that he was receiving adequate medical treatment in prison. Taking into account the circumstances of the case, the Court found that although the monitoring of the prisoner's medical correspondence had been limited to the prison medical officer, it had not struck a fair balance with his right to respect for his correspondence (§§ 49-53).

9. Correspondence with close relatives or other individuals

452. It is essential for the authorities to help prisoners maintain contact with their close relatives. In this connection the Court has stressed the importance of the recommendations set out in the European Prison Rules (*Nusret Kaya and Others v. Turkey*, § 55).

453. Some measure of control over prisoners' interaction with the outside world may be necessary (*Coşcodar v. Romania* (dec.); *Baybaşın v. the Netherlands* (dec.)), in the case of detention in a maximum-security facility).

454. The Court makes a distinction between a prisoner's correspondence with criminals or other dangerous individuals and correspondence relating to private and family life (*Čiapas v. Lithuania*, § 25). However, the interception of letters from a close relative of a prisoner charged with serious offences may be necessary to prevent crime and to ensure the proper conduct of the ongoing trial (*Kwiek v. Poland*, § 48).

455. A prisoner in a maximum-security facility may be prohibited from corresponding with relatives in the language of his choice for particular security reasons – such as the prevention of the risk of escaping – where the prisoner speaks one or more of the languages permitted for contact with close relatives (*Baybaşın v. the Netherlands* (dec.)).

456. However, the Court has not accepted the practice of requiring prisoners wishing to speak to relatives on the telephone in the only language used within their family to undergo a preliminary procedure, at their own expense, to determine whether they were genuinely unable to speak the official language (*Nusret Kaya and Others v. Turkey*, §§ 59-60). The Court also found that it was contrary to Article 8 to require a prisoner to supply an advance translation into the official language, at his own expense, of his private letters written in his mother tongue (*Mehmet Nuri Özen and Others v. Turkey*, § 60).

457. A letter from a prisoner to his or her family (or a private letter from one prisoner to another as in *Pfeifer and Plankl v. Austria*, § 47) cannot be intercepted simply because it contains criticism of or inappropriate language about prison staff (*Vlasov v. Russia*, § 138), unless there is a threat to use violence (*Silver and Others v. the United Kingdom*, §§ 65 and 103).

10. Correspondence between a prisoner and other addressees

458. Prisoners' correspondence with other addressees may be censored, for example with the Ombudsman (*Niedbala v. Poland*, § 81) or non-governmental organisations (*Jankauskas v. Lithuania*, § 19).

C. Lawyers' correspondence⁸

459. Correspondence between a lawyer and his or her client, whatever its purpose, is protected under Article 8 of the Convention, such protection being enhanced as far as confidentiality is concerned (*Michaud v. France*, §§ 117-119). This is justified by the fact that lawyers are assigned a fundamental role in a democratic society, that of defending litigants. The content of the documents intercepted is immaterial (*Laurent v. France*, § 47). Professional secrecy is "the basis of the relationship of confidence between lawyer and client" (*ibid.*) and any risk of impingement on it may have repercussions on the proper administration of justice, and hence on the rights guaranteed by Article 6 of the Convention (*Niemietz v. Germany*, § 37; *Wieser and Bicos Beteiligungen GmbH v. Austria*, § 65). Indirectly but necessarily dependent on the principle of professional secrecy is the right of everyone to a fair trial, including the right of anyone "charged with a criminal offence" not to incriminate themselves (*Michaud v. France*, § 118).

8. Not including the case of correspondence with prisoners, which is addressed in the previous chapter (Prisoners' correspondence).

460. The Court has, for example, examined the compatibility with Article 8 of the Convention of the failure to forward a letter from a lawyer to his client (*Schönenberger and Durmaz v. Switzerland*) and the tapping of a law firm’s telephone lines (*Kopp v. Switzerland*).

461. The term “correspondence” is construed broadly. It also covers lawyers’ written files (*Niemietz v. Germany*, §§ 32-33; *Roemen and Schmit v. Luxembourg*, § 65), computer hard drives (*Petri Sallinen and Others v. Finland*, § 71), electronic data (*Wieser and Bicos Beteiligungen GmbH v. Austria*, §§ 66-68; *Robathin v. Austria*, § 39; *Vinci Construction and GTM Génie Civil et Services v. France*, § 69: computer files and email accounts) belonging to a law firm and a folded piece of paper on which a lawyer had written a message and handed it to his clients (*Laurent v. France*, § 36).

462. Although professional privilege is of great importance for the lawyer, the client and the proper administration of justice, it is not inviolable (*Michaud v. France*, §§ 123 and 128-129). In the case cited, the Court examined whether the obligation for lawyers to report their suspicions of unlawful money-laundering activities by their clients, where such suspicions came to light outside the context of their defence role, amounted to disproportionate interference with legal professional privilege (no violation). In *Versini-Campinchi and Crasnianski v. France* the Court examined the interception of a lawyer’s conversation with a client whose telephone line had been tapped, thus disclosing the commission of an offence by the lawyer. The Court held that in certain circumstances an exception could be made to the principle of lawyer-client privilege (§§ 79-80).

463. Legislation requiring a lawyer to report suspicions amounts to a “continuing” interference with the lawyer’s right to respect for professional exchanges with clients (*Michaud v. France*, § 92). Interference may also occur in the context of proceedings against lawyers themselves (*Robathin v. Austria*; *Sérvulo & Associados - Sociedade de Advogados, RL and Others v. Portugal*).

464. A search of a lawyer’s office in the context of criminal proceedings against a third party may, even if it pursues a legitimate aim, encroach disproportionately on the lawyer’s professional privilege (*Niemietz v. Germany*, § 37).

465. Interference with a lawyer’s “correspondence” will result in a violation of Article 8 if it is not duly justified. To that end, it must be “in accordance with the law” (*Robathin v. Austria*, §§ 40-41), pursue one of the “legitimate aims” listed in paragraph 2 of Article 8 (*Tamosius v. the United Kingdom* (dec.); *Michaud v. France*, §§ 99 and 131) and be “necessary in a democratic society” in order to achieve that aim. The notion of necessity within the meaning of Article 8 implies that there is a pressing social need and, in particular, that the interference is proportionate to the legitimate aim pursued (*Ibid.*, § 120). Where a lawyer or law firm is affected by the interference, particular safeguards must be in place.

466. The Court has emphasised that since telephone tapping constitutes serious interference with the right to respect for a lawyer’s correspondence, it must be based on a “law” that is particularly precise, especially as the technology available for use is continually becoming more sophisticated (*Kopp v. Switzerland*, §§ 73-75). In the case cited, the Court found a violation of Article 8, firstly because the law did not state clearly how the distinction was to be drawn between matters specifically connected with a lawyer’s work and those relating to activity other than that of counsel, and secondly, the telephone tapping had been carried out by the authorities without any supervision by an independent judge (see also, regarding the protection afforded by the “law”, *Petri Sallinen and Others v. Finland*, § 92).

467. Above all, legislation and practice must afford adequate and effective safeguards against any abuse and arbitrariness (*Iliya Stefanov v. Bulgaria*, § 38). Factors taken into consideration by the Court include whether the search was based on a warrant issued on the basis of reasonable suspicion (for a case where the accused was subsequently acquitted, see *Robathin v. Austria*, § 46). The scope of the warrant must be reasonably limited. The Court has stressed the importance of carrying out the search in the presence of an independent observer in order to ensure that materials

covered by professional secrecy are not removed (*Wieser and Bicos Beteiligungen GmbH v. Austria*, § 57; *Tamosius v. the United Kingdom* (dec.); *Robathin v. Austria*, § 44). Furthermore, there must be sufficient scrutiny of the lawfulness and the execution of the warrant (*ibid.*, § 51; *Iliya Stefanov v. Bulgaria*, § 44; *Wolland v. Norway*, §§ 67-73).

468. When examining substantiated allegations that specifically identified documents have been seized even though they were unconnected to the investigation or were covered by lawyer-client privilege, the judge must conduct a “specific review of proportionality” and order their restitution where appropriate (*Vinci Construction and GTM Génie Civil et Services v. France*, § 79). For instance in *Wolland v. Norway* (no violation), the Court emphasized that the electronic documents had been available to the applicant while the search process was ongoing, in so far as the hard disk and the laptop were returned to him two days after the initial search at his premises (§§ 55-80).

469. Failure to observe the relevant procedural safeguards when conducting searches and seizures of data entails a violation of Article 8 (*Wieser and Bicos Beteiligungen GmbH v. Austria*, §§ 66-68; contrast *Tamosius v. the United Kingdom* (dec.)).

470. There is extensive case-law concerning the degree of precision of the warrant: it must contain sufficient information about the purpose of the search to allow an assessment of whether the investigation team acted unlawfully or exceeded their powers. The search must be carried out under the supervision of a sufficiently qualified and independent legal professional (*Iliya Stefanov v. Bulgaria*, § 43), whose task is to identify which documents are covered by legal professional privilege and should not be removed. There must be a practical safeguard against any interference with professional secrecy and with the proper administration of justice (*ibid.*).

471. The Court has criticised the following:

- a search warrant formulated in excessively broad terms, which left the prosecution authorities unrestricted discretion in determining which documents were “of interest” for the criminal investigation (*Aleksanyan v. Russia*, § 216);
- a search warrant based on reasonable suspicion but worded in excessively general terms (*Robathin v. Austria*, § 52);
- a warrant authorising the police to seize, for a period of two full months, the applicant’s entire computer and all his floppy disks, containing material covered by legal professional privilege (*Iliya Stefanov v. Bulgaria*, §§ 41-42).

472. The fact that protection of confidential documents is afforded by a judge is an important safeguard (*Tamosius v. the United Kingdom* (dec.)). The same applies where the impugned legislation preserves the very essence of the lawyer’s defence role and introduces a filter protecting professional privilege (*Michaud v. France*, §§ 126-129).

473. In many cases, the question of lawyers’ correspondence has been closely linked to that of searches of their offices (reference is accordingly made to the chapter on Law firms).

474. Lastly, covert surveillance of a detainee’s consultations with his lawyer at a police station must be examined from the standpoint of the principles established by the Court in relation to the interception of telephone communications between a lawyer and a client, in view of the need to afford enhanced protection of this relationship, and in particular of the confidentiality of the exchanges characterising it (*R.E. v. the United Kingdom*, § 131).

As regard persons who had been formally charged and placed under police escort, control of their correspondence with a lawyer is not of itself incompatible with the Convention. However, such control is only permissible when the authorities have reasonable cause to believe that it contains an illicit enclosure (*Laurent v. France*, §§ 44 and 46).

D. Surveillance of telecommunications in a criminal context⁹

475. The above-mentioned requirements of Article 8 § 2 must of course be satisfied in this context (*Kruslin v. France*, § 26; *Huvig v. France*, § 25). In particular, such surveillance must serve to uncover the truth. Since it represents a serious interference with the right to respect for correspondence, it must be based on a “law” that is particularly precise (*Huvig v. France*, § 32) and must form part of a legislative framework affording sufficient legal certainty (*ibid.*). The rules must be clear and detailed (the technology available for use is continually becoming more sophisticated), as well as being both accessible and foreseeable, so that anyone can foresee the consequences for themselves (*Valenzuela Contreras v. Spain*, §§ 59 and 61). This requirement of sufficiently clear rules concerns both the circumstances in which and the conditions on which the surveillance is authorised and carried out. Since the implementation of measures of secret surveillance of communications is not open to scrutiny by the individuals concerned or the public at large, the “law” would run counter to the rule of law if there were no limits to the legal discretion granted to the executive, or to a judge. Consequently, the law must indicate the scope of any such discretion and the manner of its exercise with sufficient clarity to give the individual adequate protection against arbitrary interference (*Roman Zakharov v. Russia* [GC], § 230). If there is any risk of arbitrariness in its implementation, the law will not be compatible with the lawfulness requirement (*Bykov v. Russia* [GC], §§ 78-79). In such a sensitive area as recourse to secret surveillance, the competent authority must state the compelling reasons justifying such an intrusive measure, while complying with the applicable legal instruments (*Dragojević v. Croatia*, §§ 94-98).

476. The Court has found a violation of the right to respect for correspondence in the following cases, for example: *Kruslin v. France*, § 36; *Huvig v. France*, § 35; *Malone v. the United Kingdom*, § 79; *Valenzuela Contreras v. Spain*, §§ 60-61; *Prado Bugallo v. Spain*, § 30; *Matheron v. France*, § 43; *Dragojević v. Croatia*, § 101; *Šantare and Labazņikovs v. Latvia*, § 62.

477. A person who has been subjected to telephone tapping must have access to “effective scrutiny” to be able to challenge the measures in question (*Marchiani v. France* (dec.)). To deny a person the standing to complain of the interception of his or her telephone conversations, on the ground that it was a third party’s line that had been tapped, infringes the Convention (*Lambert v. France*, §§ 38-41).

478. The Court has held that the lawful steps taken by the police to obtain the numbers dialled from a telephone in a flat were necessary in the context of an investigation into a suspected criminal offence (*P.G. and J.H. v. the United Kingdom*, §§ 42-51). It reached a similar conclusion where telephone tapping constituted one of the main investigative measures for establishing the involvement of individuals in a large-scale drug-trafficking operation, and where the measure had been subjected to “effective scrutiny” (*Coban v. Spain* (dec.)).

479. In general, the Court acknowledges the role of telephone tapping in a criminal context where it is in accordance with the law and necessary in a democratic society for, *inter alia*, public safety or the prevention of disorder or crime. Such measures assist the police and the courts in their task of preventing and punishing criminal offences. However, the State must organise their practical implementation in such a way as to prevent any abuse or arbitrariness (*Dumitru Popescu v. Romania* (no. 2)).

480. In the context of a criminal case, telephone tapping operations that were ordered by a judge, carried out under the latter’s supervision, accompanied by adequate and sufficient safeguards against abuse and subject to subsequent review by a court have been deemed proportionate to the legitimate aim pursued (*Aalmoes and Others v. the Netherlands* (dec.); *Coban v. Spain* (dec.)). The Court also found that there had been no violation of Article 8 where there was no indication that the

9. See also the chapter on II. C. f. .

interpretation and application of the legal provisions relied on by the domestic authorities had been so arbitrary or manifestly unreasonable as to render the telephone tapping operations unlawful (*İrfan Güzel v. Turkey*, § 88).

481. Furthermore, the State must ensure effective protection of the data thus obtained and of the right of persons whose purely private conversations have been intercepted by the law-enforcement authorities (*Craxi v. Italy (no. 2)*, §§ 75 and 83, violation). In *Drakšas v. Lithuania* the Court found a violation on account of leaks to the media and the broadcasting of a private conversation recorded, with the authorities' approval, on a telephone line belonging to a politician who was under investigation by the prosecuting authorities (§ 60). However, the lawful publication, in the context of constitutional proceedings, of recordings of conversations that were not private but professional and political was not found to have breached Article 8 (*Ibid.*, § 61).

E. Correspondence of private individuals, professionals and companies¹⁰

482. The right to respect for correspondence covers the private, family and professional sphere. In *Margareta and Roger Andersson v. Sweden* the Court found a violation on account of the restrictions imposed on communications by letter and telephone between a mother and her child who was in the care of social services, depriving them of almost all means of remaining in contact for a period of approximately one and a half years (§§ 95-97).

483. In *Copland v. the United Kingdom* the Court found a violation on account of the monitoring, without any legal basis, of a civil servant's telephone calls, email and Internet use (§§ 48-49). In *Halford v. the United Kingdom*, concerning workplace monitoring by a public employer, the Court found a violation in that no legal instrument regulated the interception of calls made on the telephone of the civil servant concerned (§ 51).

484. Communications from private business premises may be covered by the notion of "correspondence" (*Bărbulescu v. Romania* [GC], § 74). In this particular case, an employer had accused an employee of using an internet instant messaging service for private conversations on a work computer. The Court held that an employer's instructions could not reduce private social life in the workplace to zero. The right to respect for private life and for the privacy of correspondence continue to exist, even if these may be restricted in so far as necessary (*Bărbulescu v. Romania* [GC], § 80).

485. Contracting States have to be granted "a wide margin of appreciation" as regards the legal framework for regulating the conditions in which an employer may regulate electronic or other communications of a non-professional nature by its employees in the workplace. That said, the States' discretion is not unlimited; there is a positive obligation on the authorities to ensure that the introduction by an employer of measures to monitor correspondence and other communications, irrespective of the extent and duration of such measures, are "accompanied by adequate and sufficient safeguards against abuse". Proportionality and procedural guarantees against arbitrariness are essential in this regard (*Bărbulescu v. Romania* [GC], §§ 119-120).

486. The Court has set down a detailed list of factors by which compliance with this positive obligation should be assessed: (i) whether the employee has been notified clearly and in advance of the possibility that the employer might monitor correspondence and other communications, and of the implementation of such measures; (ii) the extent of the monitoring by the employer and the degree of intrusion into the employee's privacy (traffic and content); (iii) whether the employer has provided legitimate reasons to justify monitoring the communications and accessing their actual content; (iv) whether there is a possibility of establishing a monitoring system based on less intrusive methods and measures; (v) the seriousness of the consequences of the monitoring for the employee

¹⁰ See also the chapter on 114.

subjected to it as well as the use made of the results of monitoring; and (vi) whether the employee has been provided with adequate safeguards including, in particular, prior notification of the possibility of accessing the content of communications. Lastly, an employee whose communications have been monitored should have access to a "remedy before a judicial body with jurisdiction to determine, at least in substance, how the criteria outlined above were observed and whether the impugned measures were lawful" (*Bărbulescu v. Romania* [GC], §§ 121-122).

487. The case-law also covers the monitoring of correspondence in the context of a commercial bankruptcy (*Foxley v. the United Kingdom*, §§ 30 and 43). In *Luordo v. Italy* the Court found a violation of Article 8 on account of the repercussions of excessively lengthy bankruptcy proceedings on the bankrupt's right to respect for his correspondence (§ 78). However, the introduction of a system for monitoring the bankrupt's correspondence is not in itself open to criticism (see also *Narinen v. Finland*).

488. The question of companies' correspondence is closely linked to that of searches of their premises (reference is accordingly made to the chapter on Commercial premises). For example, in *Bernh Larsen Holding AS and Others v. Norway* the Court found no violation on account of a decision ordering a company to hand over a copy of all data on the computer server it used jointly with other companies. Although the applicable law did not require prior judicial authorisation, the Court took into account the existence of effective and adequate safeguards against abuse, the interests of the companies and their employees and the public interest in effective tax inspections (§§ 172-175). However, the Court found a violation in the case of *DELTA PEKÁRNY a.s. v. the Czech Republic*, concerning an inspection of business premises with a view to finding circumstantial and material evidence of an unlawful pricing agreement in breach of competition rules. The Court referred to the lack of prior judicial authorisation, the lack of *ex post facto* review of the necessity of the measure, and the lack of rules governing the possibility of destroying the data obtained (§§ 92-93).

F. Special secret surveillance of citizens/organisations¹¹

489. In its first judgment concerning secret surveillance, *Klass and Others v. Germany*, § 48, the Court stated, in particular: "Democratic societies nowadays find themselves threatened by highly sophisticated forms of espionage and by terrorism, with the result that the State must be able, in order effectively to counter such threats, to undertake the secret surveillance of subversive elements operating within its jurisdiction. The Court has therefore to accept that the existence of some legislation granting powers of secret surveillance over the mail, post and telecommunications is, under exceptional conditions, necessary in a democratic society in the interests of national security and/or for the prevention of disorder or crime." However, powers of secret surveillance of citizens, characterising as they do the police state, are tolerable under the Convention only in so far as strictly necessary for safeguarding the democratic institutions (*ibid.*, § 42; *Szabó and Vissy v. Hungary*, §§ 72-73). In the latter case, the Court clarified the concept of "strict necessity". Thus, a measure of secret surveillance must, in general, be strictly necessary for the safeguarding of democratic institutions and, in particular, for the obtaining of vital intelligence in an individual operation. Otherwise, there will be "abuse" on the part of the authorities (§ 73).

490. In principle, the Court does not recognise an *actio popularis*, with the result that in order to be able to lodge an application in accordance with Article 34, an individual must be able to show that he or she was "directly affected" by the measure complained of. However, in recognition of the particular features of secret surveillance measures and the importance of ensuring effective control and supervision of them, the Court has permitted general challenges to the relevant legislative regime (*Roman Zakharov v. Russia* [GC], § 165). In the case cited, it clarified the conditions in which an applicant could claim to be the "victim" of a violation of Article 8 without having to prove that

11. See also the chapter on II. C. f.

secret surveillance measures had in fact been applied to him. It based its approach on the one taken in *Kennedy v. the United Kingdom*, which it found to be best tailored to the need to ensure that the secrecy of surveillance measures did not result in the measures being effectively unchallengeable and outside the supervision of the national judicial authorities and of the Court. Accordingly, an applicant can claim to be the victim of a violation of the Convention if he or she falls within the scope of the legislation permitting secret surveillance measures (either because he or she belongs to a group of persons targeted by the legislation or because the legislation directly affects everyone) and if no remedies are available for challenging the secret surveillance. Furthermore, even where remedies do exist, an applicant may still claim to be a victim on account of the mere existence of secret measures or of legislation permitting them, if he or she is able to show that, because of his or her personal situation, he or she is potentially at risk of being subjected to such measures (§§ 171-172). See also, in relation to “victim” status, *Szabó and Vissy v. Hungary*, §§ 32-39 and the references cited therein.

491. The judgment in *Roman Zakharov v. Russia* [GC] contains a thorough overview of the Court’s case-law under Article 8 concerning the “lawfulness” (“quality of law”) and “necessity” (adequacy and effectiveness of guarantees against arbitrariness and the risk of abuse) of a system of secret surveillance (§§ 227-303). In this Grand Chamber case, the deficiencies in the domestic legal framework governing the secret surveillance of mobile telephone communications gave rise to a finding of a violation of Article 8 (§§ 302-303).

492. Secret surveillance of an individual can only be justified under Article 8 if it is “in accordance with the law”, pursues one or more of the “legitimate aims” to which paragraph 2 of Article 8 refers and is “necessary in a democratic society” in order to achieve such aims (*Szabó and Vissy v. Hungary*, § 54; *Kennedy v. the United Kingdom*, § 130).

493. As to the first point, this means that the surveillance measure must have some basis in domestic law and be compatible with the rule of law. The law must therefore meet quality requirements: it must be accessible to the person concerned and foreseeable as to its effects (*Kennedy v. the United Kingdom*, § 151). In the context of the interception of communications, “foreseeability” cannot be understood in the same way as in many other fields. Foreseeability in the special context of secret measures of surveillance cannot mean that individuals should be able to foresee when the authorities are likely to intercept their communications so that they can adapt their conduct accordingly (*Weber and Saravia v. Germany*, § 93). However, to avoid arbitrary interference, it is essential to have clear, detailed rules on the interception of telephone conversations. The law must be sufficiently clear to give citizens an adequate indication as to the circumstances in which and the conditions on which public authorities are empowered to resort to any such secret measures (*Roman Zakharov v. Russia* [GC], § 229; *Association for European Integration and Human Rights and Ekimdzhiiev v. Bulgaria*, § 75). In addition, the law must indicate the scope of the discretion granted to the executive or to a judge and the manner of its exercise with sufficient clarity to give the individual adequate protection against arbitrary interference (*ibid.*, § 230; *Malone v. the United Kingdom*, § 68; *Huvig v. France*, § 29; *Weber and Saravia v. Germany* (dec.), § 94).

A law on measures of secret surveillance must provide the following minimum safeguards against abuses of power: a definition of the nature of offences which may give rise to an interception order and the categories of people liable to have their telephones tapped; a limit on the duration of the measure; the procedure to be followed for examining, using and storing the data obtained; the precautions to be taken when communicating the data to other parties; and the circumstances in which recordings may or must be erased or destroyed (*Roman Zakharov v. Russia* [GC], §§ 231 and 238-301; *Amann v. Switzerland* [GC], §§ 56-58). For an interception regime dealing exclusively with national security issues, see *Centrum För Rättvisa v. Sweden**, below.

494. Lastly, the use of secret surveillance must pursue a legitimate aim and be “necessary in a democratic society” in order to achieve that aim.

The national authorities enjoy a certain margin of appreciation. However, this margin is subject to European supervision embracing both legislation and decisions applying it. The Court must be satisfied that there are adequate and effective guarantees against abuse (*Klass and Others v. Germany*, § 50). The assessment of this question depends on all the circumstances at issue in the case, such as the nature, scope and duration of the possible measures, the grounds required for ordering them, the authorities competent to authorise, carry out and supervise them, and the kind of remedy provided by the national law. The procedures for supervising the ordering and implementation of restrictive measures must be such as to keep the “interference” to what is “necessary in a democratic society” (*Roman Zakharov v. Russia* [GC], § 232 and the references cited therein).

Review and supervision of secret surveillance measures may come into play at three stages: when the surveillance is first ordered, while it is being carried out, or after it has been terminated (*Ibid.*, §§ 233-234 and the references cited therein). As regards the first two stages, the existing procedures must themselves provide adequate and equivalent guarantees safeguarding the individual’s rights. Since abuses are potentially easy, it is in principle desirable to entrust supervisory control to a judge, as judicial control offers the best guarantees of independence, impartiality and a proper procedure. As regards the third stage – after the surveillance has been terminated – the question of subsequent notification of surveillance measures is inextricably linked to the effectiveness of remedies before the courts and hence to the existence of effective safeguards against the abuse of monitoring powers. There is in principle little scope for recourse to the courts by the individual concerned unless the latter is advised of the measures taken without his or her knowledge and thus able to challenge their legality retrospectively or, in the alternative, unless any person who suspects that his or her communications are being or have been intercepted can apply to the courts, which retain jurisdiction even where the interception subject has not been notified of the measure (*Ibid.*, §§ 233-234).

495. It should be noted that in cases where the legislation permitting secret surveillance is itself contested, the lawfulness of the interference is closely related to the question whether the “necessity” test has been complied with, and it is therefore appropriate to address jointly the “in accordance with the law” and “necessity” requirements (*Kennedy v. the United Kingdom*, § 155; *Kvasnica v. Slovakia*, § 84). The “quality of law” in this sense implies that the domestic law must not only be accessible and foreseeable in its application, it must also ensure that secret surveillance measures are applied only when “necessary in a democratic society”, in particular by providing for adequate and effective safeguards and guarantees against abuse (*Roman Zakharov v. Russia* [GC], § 236). In the case cited, it was not disputed that the interceptions of mobile telephone communications had a basis in domestic law and pursued legitimate aims for the purposes of Article 8 § 2, namely the protection of national security and public safety, the prevention of crime and the protection of the economic well-being of the country. However, that is not enough. It is necessary to assess in addition the accessibility of the domestic law, the scope and duration of the secret surveillance measures, the procedures to be followed for storing, accessing, examining, using, communicating and destroying the intercepted data, the authorisation procedures, the arrangements for supervising the implementation of the measures, any notification mechanisms and the remedies provided for by national law (*Ibid.*, §§ 238-301).

496. *Scope of application of secret surveillance measures*: citizens must be given an adequate indication as to the circumstances in which public authorities are empowered to resort to such measures. In particular, it is important to set out clearly the nature of the offences which may give rise to an interception order and a definition of the categories of people liable to have their telephones tapped (*Roman Zakharov v. Russia* [GC], §§ 243 and 247). As regards the nature of the offences, the condition of foreseeability does not require States to set out exhaustively, by name,

the specific offences which may give rise to interception. However, sufficient detail should be provided as to the nature of the offences in question (*Kennedy v. the United Kingdom*, § 159). Interception measures in respect of a person who has not been suspected of an offence but might possess information about such an offence may be justified under Article 8 of the Convention (*Greuter v. the Netherlands* (dec.), concerning telephone tapping ordered and supervised by a judge, of which the applicant had been informed). However, the categories of persons liable to have their telephones tapped are not defined sufficiently clearly where they cover not only suspects and defendants but also “any other person involved in a criminal offence”, without any explanation as to how this term is to be interpreted (*Iordachi and Others v. Moldova*, § 44, where the applicants maintained that they ran a serious risk of having their telephones tapped because they were members of a non-governmental organisation specialising in the representation of applicants before the Court; see also *Roman Zakharov v. Russia* [GC], § 245; *Szabó and Vissy v. Hungary*, §§ 67 and 73). In the case of *Amann v. Switzerland* [GC], concerning a file opened and stored by the authorities following the interception of a telephone conversation, the Court found a violation because, among other things, the relevant law did not regulate in detail the case of individuals who were monitored “fortuitously” (§ 61).

497. Duration of surveillance: the question of the overall duration of interception measures may be left to the discretion of the authorities responsible for issuing and renewing interception warrants, provided that adequate safeguards exist, such as a clear indication in domestic law of the period after which an interception warrant will expire, the conditions under which a warrant can be renewed and the circumstances in which it must be revoked (*Roman Zakharov v. Russia* [GC], § 250; *Kennedy v. the United Kingdom*, § 161). In *Iordachi and Others v. Moldova* the domestic legislation was criticised because it did not lay down a clear limitation in time for the authorisation of a surveillance measure (§ 45).

498. *Procedures to be followed for storing, accessing, examining, using, communicating and destroying intercepted data* (*Roman Zakharov v. Russia* [GC], §§ 253-256). The automatic storage for six months of clearly irrelevant data cannot be considered justified under Article 8 (*Ibid.*, § 255). The case of *Liberty and Others v. the United Kingdom* concerned the interception by the Ministry of Defence, on the basis of a warrant, of the external communications of civil-liberties organisations. The Court found a violation, holding in particular that no indication of the procedure to be followed for selecting for examination, sharing, storing and destroying intercepted material had been accessible to the public (§ 69).

499. *Authorisation procedures*: in assessing whether the authorisation procedures are capable of ensuring that secret surveillance is not ordered haphazardly, unlawfully or without due and proper consideration, regard should be had to a number of factors, including in particular the authority competent to authorise the surveillance, the scope of its review and the contents of the interception authorisation (*Roman Zakharov v. Russia* [GC], §§ 257-267; see also *Szabó and Vissy v. Hungary*, §§ 73 and 75-77, concerning surveillance measures subject to prior judicial authorisation by the Minister of Justice and the question of emergency measures, §§ 80-81). Where a system allows the secret services and the police to intercept directly the communications of any citizen without requiring them to show an interception authorisation to the communications service provider, or to anyone else, the need for safeguards against arbitrariness and abuse appears particularly strong (*Roman Zakharov v. Russia* [GC], § 270).

500. *Supervision of the implementation of secret surveillance measures*: an obligation on the intercepting agencies to keep records of interceptions is particularly important to ensure that the supervisory body has effective access to details of surveillance activities undertaken (*Kennedy v. the United Kingdom*, § 165; *Roman Zakharov v. Russia* [GC], §§ 275-285). Although it is in principle desirable to entrust supervisory control to a judge, supervision by non-judicial bodies may be deemed compatible with the Convention, provided that the supervisory body is independent of the authorities carrying out the surveillance, and is vested with sufficient powers and competence to

perform effective and continuous supervision (*ibid.*, § 272; *Klass and Others v. Germany*, § 56). The supervisory body’s powers with respect to any breaches detected are also an important aspect for the assessment of the effectiveness of its supervision (*ibid.*, § 53, where the intercepting agency was required to terminate the interception immediately if the G10 Commission found it illegal or unnecessary; *Kennedy v. the United Kingdom*, § 168, where any intercept material was to be destroyed as soon as the Interception of Communications Commissioner discovered that the interception was unlawful; *Roman Zakharov v. Russia* [GC], § 282).

501. *Notification of interception of communications and available remedies* (*Roman Zakharov v. Russia* [GC], §§ 286-301). The secret nature of surveillance measures raises the question of notification of the person concerned so that the latter may challenge their lawfulness. Although the fact that persons affected by secret surveillance measures are not subsequently notified once the surveillance has ceased cannot by itself constitute a violation, it is nevertheless desirable to inform them after the termination of the measures “as soon as notification can be carried out without jeopardising the purpose of the restriction” (*Roman Zakharov v. Russia* [GC], §§ 287-290; *Cevat Özel v. Turkey*, §§ 34-37). The question whether it is necessary to notify an individual that he or she has been subjected to interception measures is inextricably linked to the effectiveness of domestic remedies (*Roman Zakharov v. Russia* [GC], § 286).

502. The case of *Centrum För Rättvisa v. Sweden** concerned specifically the operation of a bulk interception regime dealing exclusively with national security issues. While States enjoyed a wide margin of appreciation in deciding what type of interception regime is necessary to protect national security, the discretion afforded to them in operating an interception regime was necessarily narrower (§§ 179-181). The Court assessed the impugned interference from the standpoint of the following criteria: the accessibility of the domestic law, the scope and duration of signals intelligence, the authorisation of the measures, the procedures to be followed for storing, accessing, examining, using, communicating and destroying the intercepted data, the arrangements for supervising the implementation of the measures, any notification mechanisms and the remedies provided for by national law (§§ 111-114 and seq.).

503. With regard to secret anti-terrorist surveillance operations, the Court accepts that it is a natural consequence of the forms taken by present-day terrorism that governments resort to cutting-edge technologies, including mass surveillance of communications, in order to pre-empt impending incidents. Nevertheless, legislation governing such operations must provide the necessary safeguards against abuse regarding the ordering and implementation of surveillance measures and any potential redress (*Szabó and Vissy v. Hungary*, §§ 64, 68 and 78-81). Although the Court accepts that there may be situations of extreme urgency in which the requirement of prior judicial authorisation would entail a risk of wasting precious time, in such cases any measures authorised in advance by a non-judicial authority must be subject to an *ex post facto* judicial review (§ 81).

504. The case of *Kennedy v. the United Kingdom* concerned a former prisoner campaigning against miscarriages of justice and claiming to be the victim of surveillance measures. The Court pointed out that the power to order secret surveillance of citizens was not acceptable under Article 8 unless there were adequate and effective guarantees against abuse.

505. In the case of *Association for European Integration and Human Rights and Ekimdzhiev v. Bulgaria*, a non-profit association and a lawyer who represented applicants in proceedings before the Strasbourg Court alleged that they could be subjected to surveillance measures at any point in time without any notification. The Court observed that the relevant domestic legislation did not afford sufficient guarantees against the risk of abuse inherent in any system of secret surveillance and that the interference with the applicants’ Article 8 rights was therefore not “in accordance with the law”.

506. The case of *Association “21 December 1989” and Others v. Romania* concerned an association protecting the interests of participants in and victims of anti-government demonstrations. The Court found a violation of Article 8 (§§ 171-175; contrast *Kennedy v. the United Kingdom*, § 169, no violation).

List of cited cases

The case-law cited in this Guide refers to judgments or decisions delivered by the Court and to decisions or reports of the European Commission of Human Rights (“the Commission”).

Unless otherwise indicated, all references are to a judgment on the merits delivered by a Chamber of the Court. The abbreviation “(dec.)” indicates that the citation is of a decision of the Court and “[GC]” that the case was heard by the Grand Chamber.

Chamber judgments that were not final within the meaning of Article 44 of the Convention when this update was published are marked with an asterisk (*) in the list below. Article 44 § 2 of the Convention provides: “The judgment of a Chamber shall become final (a) when the parties declare that they will not request that the case be referred to the Grand Chamber; or (b) three months after the date of the judgment, if reference of the case to the Grand Chamber has not been requested; or (c) when the panel of the Grand Chamber rejects the request to refer under Article 43”. In cases where a request for referral is accepted by the Grand Chamber panel, it is the subsequent Grand Chamber judgment, not the Chamber judgment, that becomes final.

The hyperlinks to the cases cited in the electronic version of the Guide are directed to the HUDOC database (<http://hudoc.echr.coe.int>) which provides access to the case-law of the Court (Grand Chamber, Chamber and Committee judgments and decisions, communicated cases, advisory opinions and legal summaries from the Case-Law Information Note) and of the Commission (decisions and reports), and to the resolutions of the Committee of Ministers.

The Court delivers its judgments and decisions in English and/or French, its two official languages. HUDOC also contains translations of many important cases into more than thirty non-official languages, and links to around one hundred online case-law collections produced by third parties.

—A—

- [A v. Croatia](#), no. 55164/08, 14 October 2010
- [A. v. France](#), 23 November 1993, Series A no. 277-B
- [A, B and C v. Latvia](#), no. 30808/11, 31 March 2016
- [A, B and C v. Ireland](#) [GC], no. 25579/05, ECHR 2010
- [A.B. v. the Netherlands](#), no. 37328/97, 29 January 2002
- [A.B. and Others v. France](#), no. 11593/12, 12 July 2016
- [A.D. and O.D. v. the United Kingdom](#), no. 28680/06, 16 March 2010
- [A.D.T. v. the United Kingdom](#), no. 35765/97, ECHR 2000-IX
- [A.H. and Others v. Russia](#), nos. 6033/13 and 15 others, 17 January 2017
- [A.H. Khan v. the United Kingdom](#), no. 6222/10, 20 December 2011
- [A.K. v. Latvia](#), no. 33011/08, 24 June 2014
- [A.K. and L. v. Croatia](#), no. 37956/11, 8 January 2013
- [A.M. and A.K.v. Hungary](#) (dec.), nos. 21320/15 and 35837/15, 4 April 2017.
- [A.M. and Others v. France](#), no. 24587/12, 12 July 2016
- [A.M.M. v. Romania](#), no. 2151/10, 14 February 2012
- [A.-M.V. v. Finland](#), no. 53251/13, 23 March 2017
- [A.N. v. Lithuania](#), no. 17280/08, 31 May 2016
- [A.P., Garçon and Nicot v. France](#), nos. 79885/12 and 2 others, ECHR 2017 (extracts)
- [A.S. v. Switzerland](#), no. 39350/13, 30 June 2015
- [Aalmoes and Others v. the Netherlands](#) (dec.), no. 16269/02, 25 November 2004
- [Abdulaziz, Cabales and Balkandali v. the United Kingdom](#), 28 May 1985, Series A no. 94
- [Aboufadda v. France](#) (dec.), no. 28457/10, 4 November 2014

Acmanne and Others v. Belgium, no. 10435/83, Commission decision of 10 December, Decisions and Reports (DR) 40
Ageyev v. Russia, no. 7075/10, 18 April 2013
Agraw v. Switzerland, no. 3295/06, 29 July 2010
Ahmut v. the Netherlands, 28 November 1996, *Reports of Judgments and Decisions* 1996-VI
Ahrens v. Germany, no. 45071/09, 22 March 2012
Airey v. Ireland, 9 October 1979, Series A no. 32
Ajayi and Others v. the United Kingdom (dec.), no. 27663/95, 22 June 1999
Akdivar and Others v. Turkey, 16 September 1996, *Reports of Judgments and Decisions* 1996-IV
Akinnibosun v. Italy, no. 9056/14, 16 July 2015
Aksu v. Turkey [GC], nos. 4149/04 and 41029/04, ECHR 2012
Al-Nashif v. Bulgaria, no. 50963/99, 20 June 2002
Aldeguer Tomás v. Spain, no. 35214/09, 14 June 2016
Aleksanyan v. Russia, no. 46468/06, 22 December 2008
Alexandru Enache v. Romania, no. 16986/12, 3 October 2017
Aliiev v. Ukraine, no. 41220/98, 29 April 2003
Alkaya v. Turkey, no. 42811/06, 9 October 2012
Alves da Silva v. Portugal, no. 41665/07, 20 October 2009
Amann v. Switzerland [GC], no. 27798/95, ECHR 2000-II
Anayo v. Germany, no. 20578/07, 21 December 2010
Anchev v. Bulgaria (dec.), nos. 38334/08 and 68242/16, 5 December 2017
André and Another v. France, no. 18603/03, 24 July 2008.
Andreou Papi v. Turkey, no. 16094/90, 22 September 2009
Andrey Medvedev v. Russia, no. 75737/13, 13 September 2016
Anghel v. Italy, no. 5968/09, 25 June 2013
Animal Defenders International v. the United Kingdom [GC], no. 48876/08, ECHR 2013 (extracts)
Antović and Mirković v. Montenegro, no. 70838/13, 28 November 2017
Apanasewicz v. Poland, no. 6854/07, 3 May 2011
Argenti v. Italy, no. 56317/00, 10 November 2005
Armstrong v. the United Kingdom (dec.), no. 48521/99, 25 September 2001
Asselbourg and Others v. Luxembourg (dec.), no. 29121/95, ECHR 1999-VI
Association “21 December 1989” and Others v. Romania, nos. 33810/07 and 18817/08, 24 May 2011
Association for European Integration and Human Rights and Ekimdzhiev v. Bulgaria, no. 62540/00, 28 June 2007
August v. the United Kingdom (dec.), no. 36505/02, 21 January 2003
Avilkina and Others v. Russia, no. 1585/09, 6 June 2013
Axel Springer AG v. Germany [GC], no. 39954/08, 7 February 2012
Aycaguer v. France, no. 8806/12, 22 June 2017

—B—

B. v. France, 25 March 1992, Series A no. 232-C
B.B. v. France, no. 5335/06, 17 December 2009
B. v. Moldova, no. 61382/09, 16 July 2013
B. v. Romania (no. 2), no. 1285/03, 19 February 2013
B. v. the United Kingdom, 8 July 1987, Series A no. 121
B.A.C. v. Greece, no. 11981/15, 13 October 2016
B.B. and F.B. v. Germany, nos. 18734/09 and 9424/11, 14 March 2013
B.C. v. Switzerland, no. 21353/93, Commission decision of 27 February 1995
Babiarz v. Poland, no. 1955/10, 10 January 2017
Babylonová v. Slovakia, no. 69146/01, ECHR 2006-VIII
Băcilă v. Romania, no. 19234/04, 30 March 2010

Bagdonavicius and Others v. Russia, no. 19841/06, 11 October 2016
Bagiyeva v. Ukraine, no. 41085/05, 28 April 2016
Bah v. the United Kingdom, no. 56328/07, ECHR 2011
Bărbulescu v. Romania [GC], no. 61496/08, ECHR 2017 (extracts)
Baybaşın v. the Netherlands (dec.), no. 13600/02, 6 October 2005
Baytüre and Others v. Turkey (dec.), no. 3270/09, 12 March 2013
Beard v. the United Kingdom [GC], no. 24882/94, 18 January 2001
Beck and Others v. the United Kingdom, nos. 48535/99 and 2 others, 22 October 2002
Bédat v. Switzerland [GC], no. 56925/08, ECHR 2016
Benhebba v. France, no. 53441/99, 10 July 2003
Benedik v. Slovenia, no. 62357/14, 24 April 2018
Benediktsdóttir v. Iceland (dec.), no. 38079/06, 16 June 2009
Benes v. Austria, no. 18643/91, Commission decision of 6 January 1992, DR 72
Bensaid v. the United Kingdom, no. 44599/98, ECHR 2001-I
Berger-Krall and Others v. Slovenia, no. 14717/04, 12 June 2014
Berisha v. Switzerland, no. 948/12, 30 July 2013
Bernh Larsen Holding AS and Others v. Norway, no. 24117/08, 14 March 2013
Berrehab v. the Netherlands, 21 June 1988, Series A no. 138
Bevacqua and S. v. Bulgaria, no. 71127/01, 12 June 2008
Bianchi v. Switzerland, no. 7548/04, 22 June 2006
Biao v. Denmark [GC], no. 38590/10, ECHR 2016
Biao v. Denmark, no. 38590/10, 25 March 2014
Bigaeva v. Greece, no. 26713/05, 28 May 2009
Biržietis v. Lithuania, no. 49304/09, 14 June 2016
Birzniaks v. Latvia, no. 65025/01, 31 May 2011
Bistieva and Others v. Poland, no. 75157/14, 10 April 2018
Bjedov v. Croatia, no. 42150/09, 29 May 2012
Blaga v. Romania, no. 54443/10, 1 July 2014
Boffa and Others v. San Marino, no. 26536/95, Commission decision of 15 January 1998, DR 27
Bohlen v. Germany, no. 53495/09, 19 February 2015
Bondavalli v. Italy, no. 35532/12, 17 November 2015
Bor v. Hungary, no. 50474/08, 18 June 2013
Boris Popov v. Russia, no. 23284/04, 28 October 2010
Borysiewicz v. Poland, no. 71146/01, 1 July 2008
Bosphorus Hava Yolları Turizm ve Ticaret Anonim Şirketi v. Ireland [GC], no. 45036/98, 30 June 2005
Botta v. Italy, 24 February 1998, *Reports of Judgments and Decisions 1998-I*
Boughanemi v. France, 24 April 1996, *Reports of Judgments and Decisions 1996-II*
Boujlifa v. France, 21 October 1997, *Reports of Judgments and Decisions 1997-VI*
Boyle v. the United Kingdom, 28 February 1994, Series A no. 282-B
Boyle and Rice v. the United Kingdom, 27 April 1988, Series A no. 131
Brândușe v. Romania, no. 6586/03, 7 April 2009
Brecknell v. the United Kingdom, no. 32457/04, 27 November 2007
Bremner v. Turkey, no. 37428/06, 13 October 2015
Brežec v. Croatia, no. 7177/10, 18 July 2013
Brito Ferrinho Bexiga Villa-Nova v. Portugal, no. 69436/10, 1 December 2015
Brüggemann and Scheuten v. Germany, no. 6959/75, Commission decision of 19 May 1976, DR 5
Buck v. Germany, no. 41604/98, 28 April 2005
Buckland v. the United Kingdom, no. 40060/08, 18 September 2012
Buckley v. the United Kingdom, 25 September 1996, *Reports of Judgments and Decisions 1996-IV*
Buglov v. Ukraine, no. 28825/02, 10 July 2014
Burghartz v. Switzerland, 22 February 1994, Series A no. 280-B

Buscemi v. Italy, no. 29569/95, ECHR 1999-VI
Butt v. Norway, no. 47017/09, 4 December 2012
Bykov v. Russia [GC], no. 4378/02, 10 March 2009

—C—

C. v. Belgium, 7 August 1996, *Reports of Judgments and Decisions* 1996-III
C.A.S. and C.S. v. Romania, no. 26692/05, 20 March 2012
C.C. v. Spain, no. 1425/06, 6 October 2009
Călin and Others v. Romania, nos. 25057/11 and 2 others, 19 July 2016
Calogero Diana v. Italy, 15 November 1996, *Reports of Judgments and Decisions* 1996-V
Camenzind v. Switzerland, 16 December 1997, *Reports of Judgments and Decisions* 1997-VIII
Camp and Bourimi v. the Netherlands, no. 28369/95, ECHR 2000-X
Campbell v. the United Kingdom, 25 March 1992, Series A no. 233
Canonne v. France (dec.), no. 22037/13, 2 June 2015
Carlson v. Switzerland, no. 49492/06, 6 November 2008
*Centrum För Rättvisa v. Sweden**, no. 35252/08, 19 June 2018
Cevat Özel v. Turkey, no. 19602/06, 7 June 2016
Chadimová v. the Czech Republic, no. 50073/99, 18 April 2006
Chapin and Charpentier v. France, no. 40183/07, 9 June 2016
Chapman v. the United Kingdom [GC], no. 27238/95, ECHR 2001-I
Chappell v. the United Kingdom, 30 March 1989, Series A no. 152-A
Chauvy and Others v. France, no. 64915/01, ECHR 2004-VI
Chaykovskiy v. Ukraine, no. 2295/06, 15 October 2009
Chbihi Loudoudi and Others v. Belgium, no. 52265/10, 16 December 2014
Chelu v. Romania, no. 40274/04, 12 January 2010
Chiragov and Others v. Armenia [GC], no. 13216/05, ECHR 2015
Chiş v. Romania (dec.), no. 55396/07, 9 September 2014
Chishti v. Portugal (dec.), no. 57248/00, 2 October 2003
Christie v. the United Kingdom, no. 21482/93, Commission decision of 27 June 1994, DR 78-B
Christine Goodwin v. the United Kingdom [GC], no. 28957/95, ECHR 2002-VI
Chukayev v. Russia, no. 36814/06, 5 November 2015
Čiapas v. Lithuania, no. 4902/02, 16 November 2006
Cincimino v. Italy, no. 68884/13, 28 April 2016
Ciszewski v. Poland (dec.), no. 38668/97, 13 July 2004
Ciubotaru v. Moldova, no. 27138/04, 27 April 2010
Coban v. Spain (dec.), no. 17060/02, 25 September 2006
Codarcea v. Romania, no. 31675/04, 2 June 2009
Codona v. the United Kingdom (dec.), no. 485/05, 7 February 2006
Concetta Schembri v. Malta (dec.), no. 66297/13, 19 September 2017
Connors v. the United Kingdom, no. 66746/01, 27 May 2004
Copland v. the United Kingdom, no. 62617/00, ECHR 2007-I
Coşcodar v. Romania (dec.), no. 36020/06, 9 March 2010
Cossey v. the United Kingdom, 27 September 1990, Series A no. 184
Coteleş v. Romania, no. 38565/97, 3 June 2003
Couderc and Hachette Filipacchi Associés v. France [GC], no. 40454/07, ECHR 2015 (extracts)
Ćosić v. Croatia, no. 28261/06, 15 January 2009
Costa and Pavan v. Italy, no. 54270/10, 28 August 2012
Costello-Roberts v. the United Kingdom, 25 March 1993, Series A no. 247-C
Coster v. the United Kingdom [GC], no. 24876/94, 18 January 2001
Coteleş v. Romania, no. 38565/97, 3 June 2003
Courten v. the United Kingdom (dec.), no. 4479/06, 4 November 2008

Craxi v. Italy (no. 2), no. 25337/94, 17 July 2003
Crémieux v. France, 25 February 1993, Series A no. 256-B
Cronin v. the United Kingdom (dec.), no. 15848/03, 6 June 2004
Csoma v. Romania, no. 8759/05, 15 January 2013
Cvijetić v. Croatia, no. 71549/01, 26 February 2004
Cyprus v. Turkey [GC], no. 25781/94, 10 May 2001

—D—

D. and Others v. Belgium (dec.), no. 29176/13, 8 July 2014
D.L. v. Bulgaria, no. 7472/14, 19 May 2016
Dadouch v. Malta, no. 38816/07, 20 July 2010
Daniliuc v. Romania (dec.), no. 7262/06, 2 October 2012
Davison v. the United Kingdom (dec.), no. 52990/08, 2 March 2010
De Souza Ribeiro v. France [GC], no. 22689/07, ECHR 2012
Deés v. Hungary, no. 2345/06, 9 November 2010
DELTA PEKÁRNY a.s. v. the Czech Republic, no. 97/11, 2 October 2014
Demades v. Turkey, no. 16219/90, 31 July 2003
Demirtepe v. France, no. 34821/97, ECHR 1999-IX (extracts)
Demopoulos and Others v. Turkey (dec.) [GC], nos. 46113/99 and 7 others, ECHR 2010
Diamante and Pelliccioni v. San Marino, no. 32250/08, 27 September 2011
Di Giovine v. Italy, no. 39920/98, 26 July 2001
Di Sarno and Others v. Italy, no. 30765/08, 10 January 2012
Di Trizio v. Switzerland, no. 7186/09, 2 February 2016
Dickson v. the United Kingdom [GC], no. 44362/04, ECHR 2007-V
Doerga v. the Netherlands, no. 50210/99, 27 April 2004
Doğan and Others v. Turkey [GC], no. 62649/10, 26 April 2016
Domenichini v. Italy, 15 November 1996, *Reports of Judgments and Decisions* 1996-V
Đorđević v. Croatia, no. 41526/10, ECHR 2012
Dragojević v. Croatia, no. 68955/11, 15 January 2015
Drakšas v. Lithuania, no. 36662/04, 31 July 2012
Draon v. France (just satisfaction – striking out) [GC], no. 1513/03, ECHR 2006-IX
Drakšas v. Lithuania, no. 36662/04, 31 July 2012
Dubetska and Others v. Ukraine, no. 30499/03, 10 February 2011
Dubská and Krejzová v. the Czech Republic [GC], nos. 28859/11 and 28473/12, 15 November 2016
Dudgeon v. the United Kingdom, 22 October 1981, Series A no. 45
Dumitru Popescu v. Romania (no. 2), no. 71525/01, 26 April 2007
Đurđević v. Croatia, no. 52442/09, ECHR 2011 (extracts)
Durisotto v. Italy (dec.), no. 62804/13, 6 May 2014
Dzemyuk v. Ukraine, no. 42488/02, 4 September 2014

—E—

E.B. v. France [GC], no. 43546/02, 22 January 2008
Ebcin v. Turkey, no. 19506/05, 1 February 2011
Egill Einarsson v. Iceland, no. 24703/15, 7 November 2017
Ekinci and Akalin v. Turkey, no. 77097/01, 30 January 2007
Elberte v. Latvia, no. 61243/08, ECHR 2015
El Boujaïdi v. France, 26 September 1997, *Reports of Judgments and Decisions* 1997-VI
El-Masri v. the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia [GC], no. 39630/09, ECHR 2012
Elli Poluhas Dödsbo v. Sweden, no. 61564/00, ECHR 2006-I
Elsholz v. Germany [GC], no. 25735/94, ECHR 2000-VIII
Emonet and Others v. Switzerland, no. 39051/03, 13 December 2007

Enea v. Italy [GC], no. 74912/01, ECHR 2009
Erdem v. Germany, no. 38321/97, ECHR 2001-VII (extracts)
Eremia v. the Republic of Moldova, no. 3564/11, 28 May 2013
Eriksson v. Sweden, 22 June 1989, Series A no. 156
Ernst and Others v. Belgium, no. 33400/96, 15 July 2003
Ernst August von Hannover v. Germany, no. 53649/09, 19 February 2015
Eryiğit v. Turkey, no. 18356/11, 10 April 2018
Estate of Kresten Filtenborg Mortensen v. Denmark (dec.), no. 1338/03, ECHR 2006-V
Evans v. the United Kingdom [GC], no. 6339/05, ECHR 2007-I

—F—

Fadeyeva v. Russia, no. 55723/00, ECHR 2005-IV
Fägerskiöld v. Sweden (dec.), no. 37664/04, 26 February 2008
Fawsie v. Greece, no. 40080/07, 28 October 2010
Faulkner v. the United Kingdom (dec.), no. 37471/97, 18 September 2001
Fazil Ahmet Tamer v. Turkey, no. 6289/02, 5 December 2006
Fernández Martínez v. Spain [GC], no. 56030/07, ECHR 2014 (extracts)
Flamenbaum and Others v. France, nos. 3675/04 and 23264/04, 13 December 2012
Folgerø and Others v. Norway [GC], no. 15472/02, ECHR 2007-III
Foulon and Bouvet v. France, nos. 9063/14 and 10410/14, 21 July 2016
Foxley v. the United Kingdom, no. 33274/96, 20 June 2000
Frankowski v. Poland (dec.), no. 25002/09, 20 September 2011
Frérot v. France, no. 70204/01, 12 June 2007
Fretté v. France, no. 36515/97, ECHR 2002-I
Friend and Others v. the United Kingdom (dec.), nos. 16072/06 and 27809/08, 24 November 2009
*Fröhlich v. Germany**, no. 16112/15, 26 July 2018
Funke v. France, 25 February 1993, Series A no. 256-A
Furlepa v. Poland (dec.), no. 62101/00, 18 March 2008
Fürst-Pfeifer v. Austria, nos. 33677/10 and 52340/10, 17 May 2016

—G—

G.B. v. Lithuania, no. 36137/13, 19 January 2016
G.N. v. Poland, no. 2171/14, 19 July 2016
G.S. v. Georgia, no. 2361/13, 21 July 2015
G.S.B. v. Switzerland, no. 28601/11, 22 December 2015
Gagiu v. Romania, no. 63258/00, 24 February 2009
Galev and Others v. Bulgaria (dec.), no. 18324/04, 29 September 2009
Galović v. Croatia (dec.), no. 54388/09, 5 March 2013
Gard and Others v. the United Kingdom (dec.), no. 39793/17, 27 June 2017
Gardel v. France, no. 16428/05, ECHR 2009
Garib v. the Netherlands [GC], no. 43494/09, ECHR 2017
Garnaga v. Ukraine, no. 20390/07, 16 May 2013
Gas and Dubois v. France (dec.), no. 25951/07, 31 August 2010
Gas and Dubois v. France, no. 25951/07, 15 March 2012
Gaskin v. the United Kingdom, 7 July 1989, Series A no. 160
Genovese v. Malta, no. 53124/09, 11 October 2011
Georgel and Georgeta Stoicescu v. Romania, no. 9718/03, 26 July 2011
Giacomelli v. Italy, no. 59909/00, ECHR 2006-XII
Gillan and Quinton v. the United Kingdom, no. 4158/05, ECHR 2010 (extracts)
Gillberg v. Sweden [GC], no. 41723/06, 3 April 2012
Gillow v. the United Kingdom, 24 November 1986, Series A no. 109

Giorgi Nikolaishvili v. Georgia, no. 37048/04, 13 January 2009
Giorgioni v. Italy, no. 43299/12, 15 September 2016
Girard v. France, no. 22590/04, 30 June 2011
Gladysheva v. Russia, no. 7097/10, 6 December 2011
Glass v. the United Kingdom, no. 61827/00, ECHR 2004-II
Gnahoré v. France, no. 40031/98, ECHR 2000-IX
Godelli v. Italy, no. 33783/09, 25 September 2012
Golder v. the United Kingdom, 21 February 1975, Series A no. 18
Golovan v. Ukraine, no. 41716/06, 5 July 2012
Gough v. the United Kingdom, no. 49327/11, 28 October 2014
Gözüm v. Turkey, no. 4789/10, 20 January 2015
Grace v. the United Kingdom, no. 11523/85, Commission report of 15 December 1988
Grant v. the United Kingdom, no. 32570/03, ECHR 2006-VII
Greenpeace e.V. and Others v. Germany (dec.), no. 18215/06, 12 May 2009
Greuter v. the Netherlands (dec.), no. 40045/98, 19 March 2002
Grimkovskaya v. Ukraine, no. 38182/03, 21 July 2011
Guerra and Others v. Italy, 19 February 1998, *Reports of Judgments and Decisions* 1998-I
Guillot v. France, 24 October 1996, *Reports of Judgments and Decisions* 1996-V
Gül v. Switzerland, 19 February 1996, *Reports of Judgments and Decisions* 1996-I
Gutsanovi v. Bulgaria, no. 34529/10, ECHR 2013 (extracts)
Güzel Erdagöz v. Turkey, no. 37483/02, 21 October 2008

—H—

H.E. v. Turkey, no. 30498/96, 22 December 2005
H.M. v. Turkey, no. 34494/97, 8 August 2006
Haas v. the Netherlands, no. 36983/97, ECHR 2004-I
Haas v. Switzerland, no. 31322/07, ECHR 2011
Haase v. Germany, no. 11057/02, ECHR 2004-III (extracts)
Hachette Filipacchi Associés v. France, no. 71111/01, 14 June 2007
Hadri-Vionnet v. Switzerland, no. 55525/00, 14 February 2008
Hadzhieva v. Bulgaria, no. 45285/12, 1 February 2018
Hajduová v. Slovakia, no. 2660/03, 30 November 2010
Haldimann and Others v. Switzerland, no. 21830/09, ECHR 2015
Halford v. the United Kingdom, 25 June 1997, *Reports of Judgments and Decisions* 1997-III
Hämäläinen v. Finland [GC], no. 37359/09, ECHR 2014
Hanzelkovi v. the Czech Republic, no. 43643/10, 11 December 2014
Haralambie v. Romania, no. 21737/03, 27 October 2009
Hardy and Maile v. the United Kingdom, no. 31965/07, 14 February 2012
Harroudj v. France, no. 43631/09, 4 October 2012
Hartung v. France (dec.), no. 10231/07, 3 November 2009
Hatton and Others v. the United Kingdom [GC], no. 36022/97, ECHR 2003-VIII
Havelka and Others v. the Czech Republic, no. 23499/06, 21 June 2007
Heino v. Finland, no. 56720/09, 15 February 2011
Helander v. Finland (dec.), no. 10410/10, 10 September 2013
Henry Kismoun v. France, no. 32265/10, 5 December 2013
Herczegfalvy v. Austria, 24 September 1992, Series A no. 244
Hode and Abdi v. the United Kingdom, no. 22341/09, 6 November 2012
Hofmann v. Germany (dec.), no. 1289/09, 23 February 2010
Hoffmann v. Austria, 23 June 1993, Series A no. 255-C
Hokkanen v. Finland, 23 September 1994, Series A no. 299-A
Hoti v. Croatia, no. 63311/14, 26 April 2018

Howard v. the United Kingdom, no. 10825/84, Commission decision of 18 October 1985, DR 52
Hristozov and Others v. Bulgaria, nos. 47039/11 and 358/12, ECHR 2012 (extracts)
Hromadka and Hromadkova v. Russia, no. 22909/10, 11 December 2014
Huvig v. France, 24 April 1990, Series A no. 176-B

— I —

İrfan Güzel v. Turkey, no. 35285/08, 7 February 2017
I. v. the United Kingdom [GC], no. 25680/94, 11 July 2002
I.G. and Others v. Slovakia, no. 15966/04, 13 November 2012
I.S. v. Germany, no. 31021/08, 5 June 2014
Iambor v. Romania (no. 1), no. 64536/01, 24 June 2008
İbrahim Keskin v. Turkey, no. 10491/12, 27 March 2018
Idalov v. Russia [GC], no. 5826/03, 22 May 2012
Iglesias Gil and A.U.I. v. Spain, no. 56673/00, ECHR 2003-V
Ignaccolo-Zenide v. Romania, no. 31679/96, ECHR 2000-I
Igors Dmitrijevs v. Latvia, no. 61638/00, 30 November 2006
Ilaşcu and Others v. Moldova and Russia [GC], no. 48787/99, ECHR 2004-VII
Iliya Stefanov v. Bulgarie, no. 65755/01, 22 May 2008
Iordachi and Others v. the Republic of Moldova, no. 25198/02, 10 February 2009
Ireland v. the United Kingdom, 18 January 1978, Series A no. 25
Irina Smirnova v. Ukraine, no. 1870/05, 13 October 2016
Işıldak v. Turkey, no. 12863/02, 30 September 2008
Ivan Atanasov v. Bulgaria, no. 12853/03, 2 December 2010
Ivanova and Cherkezov v. Bulgaria, no. 46577/15, 21 April 2016
Ivanovski v. the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, no. 29908/11, 21 January 2016

— J —

Jacquier v. France (dec.), no. 45827, 1 September 2009
Jane Smith v. the United Kingdom [GC], no. 25154/94, 18 January 2001
Jankauskas v. Lithuania, no. 59304/00, 24 February 2005
Jankauskas v. Lithuania (no. 2), no. 50446/09, 27 June 2017
Jeronovičs v. Latvia [GC], no. 44898/10, ECHR 2016
Jeunesse v. the Netherlands [GC], no. 12738/10, 3 October 2014
Jöcks v. Germany (dec.), no. 23560/02, 23 March 2006
Joanna Szulc v. Poland, no. 43932/08, 13 November 2012
Johansen v. Norway, 7 August 1996, *Reports of Judgments and Decisions* 1996-III
Johansson v. Finland, no. 10163/02, 6 September 2007
Johnston and Others v. Ireland, 18 December 1986, Series A no. 112
Jolie and Others v. Belgium, no. 11418/85, Commission decision of 14 May 1986, DR 47
Jovanovic v. Sweden, no. 10592/12, 22 October 2015
Jucius and Juciuvienė v. Lithuania, no. 14414/03, 25 November 2008
Jurica v. Croatia, no. 30376/13, 2 May 2017

— K —

K2 v. the United Kingdom (dec.), no. 42387/13, 7 February 2017
K.A. v. Finland, no. 27751/95, 14 January 2003
K.H. and Others v. Slovakia, no. 32881/04, ECHR 2009 (extracts)
K.J. v. Poland, no. 30813/14, 1 March 2016
K. and T. v. Finland [GC], no. 25702/94, ECHR 2001-VII
K.S. and M.S. v. Germany, no. 33696/11, 6 October 2016

K.U. v. Finland, no. 2872/02, ECHR 2008
Kacper Nowakowski v. Poland, no. 32407/13, 10 January 2017
Kahn v. Germany, no. 16313/10, 17 March 2016
Kalucza v. Hungary, no. 57693/10, 24 April 2012
Kaftailova v. Latvia (striking out) [GC], no. 59643/00, 7 December 2007
Karashev v. Finland (dec.), no. 31414/96, ECHR 1999-II
Karner v. Austria, no. 40016/98, ECHR 2003-IX
Karrer v. Romania, no. 16965/10, 21 February 2012
Kay and Others v. the United Kingdom, no. 37341/06, 21 September 2010
Kearns v. France, no. 35991/04, 10 January 2008
Keegan v. Ireland, 26 May 1994, Series A no. 290
Keegan v. the United Kingdom, no. 28867/03, ECHR 2006-X
Kennedy v. the United Kingdom, no. 26839/05, 18 May 2010
Kent Pharmaceuticals Limited and Others v. the United Kingdom (dec.), no. 9355/03, 11 October 2005
Kepeneklioğlu v. Turkey, no. 73520/01, 23 January 2007
Keslassy v. France (dec.), no. 51578/99, ECHR 2002-I
Khamidov v. Russia, no. 72118/01, 15 November 2007
Khan v. the United Kingdom, no. 35394/97, ECHR 2000-V
Khmel v. Russia, no. 20383/04, 12 December 2013
Khodorkovskiy and Lebedev v. Russia, nos. 11082/06 and 13772/05, 25 July 2013
Khoroshenko v. Russia [GC], no. 41418/04, ECHR 2015
Khuzhin and Others v. Russia, no. 13470/02, 23 October 2008
Kilyen v. Romania, no. 44817/04, 25 February 2014
Király and Dömötör v. Hungary, no. 10851/13, 17 January 2017
Klass and Others v. Germany, 6 September 1978, Series A no. 28
Klyakhin v. Russia, no. 46082/99, 30 November 2004
Knecht v. Romania, no. 10048/10, 2 October 2012
Koceniak v. Poland (dec.), no. 1733//06, 17 June 2014
Koch v. Germany, no. 497/09, 19 July 2012
Kocherov and Sergejeva v. Russia, no. 16899/13, 29 March 2016
Kolesnichenko v. Russia, no. 19856/04, 9 April 2009
Kolonja v. Greece, no. 49441/12, 19 May 2016
Kolyadenko and Others v. Russia, nos. 17423/05 and 5 others 28 February 2012
Konovalova v. Russia, no. 37873/04, 9 October 2014
Konstantin Markin v. Russia [GC], no. 30078/06, ECHR 2012 (extracts)
Kopf and Liberda v. Austria, no. 1598/06, 17 January 2012
Kopp v. Switzerland, 25 March 1998, *Reports of Judgments and Decisions* 1998-II
Korelc v. Slovenia, no. 28456/03, 12 May 2009
Kornakovs v. Latvia, no. 61005/00, 15 June 2006
Kotiy v. Ukraine, no. 28718/09, 5 March 2015
Kozak v. Poland, no. 13102/02, 2 March 2010
Kroon and Others v. the Netherlands, 27 October 1994, Series A no. 297-C
Kruslin v. France, 24 April 1990, Series A no. 176-A
Kruškić v. Croatia (dec.), no. 10140/13, 25 November 2014
Krušković v. Croatia, no. 46185/08, 21 June 2011
Kryvitska and Kryvitskyy v. Ukraine, no. 30856/03, 2 December 2010
Kuppinger v. Germany, no. 62198/11, 15 January 2015
Kučera v. Slovakia, no. 48666/99, 17 July 2007
Kurić and Others v. Slovenia [GC], no. 26828/06, ECHR 2012 (extracts)
Kurkowski v. Poland, no. 36228/06, 9 April 2013

Kurochkin v. Ukraine, no. 42276/08, 20 May 2010
Kutzner v. Germany, no. 46544/99, ECHR 2002-I
Kvasnica v. Slovakia, no. 72094/01, 9 June 2009
Kwakyé-Nti and Dufie v. the Netherlands (dec.), no. 31519/96, 7 November 2000
Kwiek v. Poland, no. 51895/99, 30 May 2006
Kyrtatos v. Greece, no. 41666/98, ECHR 2003-VI (extracts)

—L—

L. v. Finland, no. 25651/94, 27 April 2000
L. v. Lithuania, no. 27527/03, ECHR 2007-IV
L. v. the Netherlands, no. 45582/99, ECHR 2004-IV
L.M. v. Italy, no. 60033/00, 8 February 2005
Labassee v. France, no. 65941/11, 26 June 2014
Labita v. Italy [GC], no. 26772/95, ECHR 2000-IV
La Parola and Others v. Italy (dec.), no. 39712/98, 30 November 2000
Lambert v. France, 24 August 1998, *Reports of Judgments and Decisions* 1998-V
Lambert and Others v. France [GC], no. 46043/14, ECHR 2015 (extracts)
Larkos v. Cyprus [GC], no. 29515/95, ECHR 1999-I
Laurent v. France, no. 28798/13, 24 May 2018
Laskey, Jaggard and Brown v. the United Kingdom, 19 February 1997, *Reports of Judgments and Decisions* 1997-I
Lavents v. Latvia, no. 58442/00, 28 November 2002
Lazoriva v. Ukraine, no. 6878/14, 17 April 2018
Leander v. Sweden, 26 March 1987, Series A no. 116
Lee v. the United Kingdom [GC], no. 25289/94, 18 January 2001
Leveau and Fillon v. France, nos. 63512/00 and 63513/00, ECHR 2005-X
Libert v. France, no. 588/13, 22 February 2018
Liberty and Others v. the United Kingdom, no. 58243/00, 1 July 2008
Lipkowsky and Mc Cormack v. Germany (dec.), no. 26755/10, 18 January 2011
Loizidou v. Turkey (merits), 18 December 1996, *Reports of Judgments and Decisions* 1996-VI
Losonci Rose and Rose v. Switzerland, no. 664/06, 9 November 2010
López Guió v. Slovakia, no. 10280/12, 3 June 2014
López Ostra v. Spain, 9 December 1994, Series A no. 303-C
Lozovyye v. Russia, no. 4587/09, 24 April 2018
Lüdi v. Switzerland, 15 June 1992, Series A no. 238
Luordo v. Italy, no. 32190/96, ECHR 2003-IX
Lustig-Prean and Beckett v. the United Kingdom, nos. 31417/96 and 32377/96, 27 September 1999

—M—

M.A.K. and R.K. v. the United Kingdom, no. 45901/05, 23 March 2010
M. v. Switzerland, no. 41199/06, 26 April 2011
M. and Others v. Bulgaria, no. 41416/08, 26 July 2011
M.B. v. France, no. 22115/06, 17 December 2009
M.C. v. Bulgaria, no. 39272/98, ECHR 2003-XII
M.D. and Others v. Malta, no. 64791/10, 17 July 2012
M.G. v. the United Kingdom, no. 39393/98, 24 September 2002
M.K. v. France, no. 19522/09, 18 April 2013
M. and M. v. Croatia, no. 10161/13, ECHR 2015 (extracts)
*M.L. and W.W. v. Germany**, nos. 60798/10 and 65599/10, 28 June 2018
M.M. v. the Netherlands, no. 39339/98, 8 April 2003
M.M. v. the United Kingdom, no. 24029/07, 13 November 2012

M.N. and Others v. San Marino, no. 28005/12, 7 July 2015
M.R. and L.R. v. Estonia (dec.), no. 13429/12, 15 May 2012
M.W. v. the United Kingdom (dec.), no. 11313/02, 23 June 2009
M.G.C. v. Romania, no. 61495/11, 15 March 2016
M.S. v. Sweden, 27 August 1997, § 35, Reports 1997-IV
Macalin Moxamed Sed Dahir v. Switzerland (dec.), no. 12209/10, 15 September 2015
Macready v. the Czech Republic, nos. 4824/06 and 15512/08, 22 April 2010
Maire v. Portugal, no. 48206/99, ECHR 2003-VII
Maksym v. Poland, no. 14450/02, 19 December 2006
Malec v. Poland, no. 28623/12, 28 June 2016
Malone v. the United Kingdom, 2 August 1984, Series A no. 82
Mamchur v. Ukraine, no. 10383/09, 16 July 2015
Mandet v. France, no. 30955/12, 14 January 2016
Marchiani v. France (dec.), no. 30392/03, 27 May 2008
Marckx v. Belgium, 13 June 1979, Series A no. 31
Margareta and Roger Andersson v. Sweden, no. 12963/87, 25 February 1992
Marinis v. Greece, no. 3004/10, 9 October 2014
Martínez Martínez v. Spain, no. 21532/08, 18 October 2011
Martínez Martínez and Pino Manzano v. Spain, no. 61654/08, 3 July 2012
Maslák and Michálková v. the Czech Republic, no. 52028/13, 14 January 2016
Maslov v. Austria, no. 1638/03, 23 June 2008
Matheron v. France, no. 57752/00, 29 March 2005
Maumousseau and Washington v. France, no. 39388/05, 6 December 2007
Maurice v. France [GC], no. 11810/03, ECHR 2005-IX
Mazurek v. France, no. 34406/97, ECHR 2000-II
McCallum v. the United Kingdom, 30 August 1990, Series A no. 183
McCann v. the United Kingdom, no. 19009/04, ECHR 2008
McDonald v. the United Kingdom, no. 4241/12, 20 May 2014
McGinley and Egan v. the United Kingdom, 9 June 1998, *Reports of Judgments and Decisions* 1998-III
McKay-Kopecka v. Poland (dec.), no. 45320/99, 19 September 2006
McLeod v. the United Kingdom, 23 September 1998, *Reports of Judgments and Decisions* 1998-VII
McMichael v. the United Kingdom, 24 February 1995, Series A no. 307-B
Medžlis Islamske Zajednice Brčko and Others v. Bosnia and Herzegovina [GC], no 17224/11, ECHR 2017
Mehmet Nuri Özen and Others v. Turkey, nos. 15672/08 and 10 others, 11 January 2011
Mehmet Salih and Abdülsamet Çakmak v. Turkey, no. 45630/99, 29 April 2004
Meimanis v. Latvia, no. 70597/11, 21 July 2015
Mengesha Kimfe v. Switzerland, no. 24404/05, 29 July 2010
Menesson v. France, no. 65192/11, ECHR 2014 (extracts)
Menteş and Others v. Turkey, 28 November 1997, *Reports of Judgments and Decisions* 1997-VIII
Mentzen v. Latvia (dec.), no. 71074/01, ECHR 2004-XII
Messina v. Italy, 26 February 1993, Series A no. 257-H
Messina v. Italy (no. 2), no. 25498/94, ECHR 2000-X
M.P. and Others v. Bulgaria, no. 22457/08, 15 November 2011
Maslov v. Austria [GC], no. 1638/03, ECHR 2008
MGN Limited v. the United Kingdom, no. 39401/04, 18 January 2011
Mialhe v. France (no. 1), 25 February 1993, Series A no. 256-C
Michael Edward Cooke v. Austria, no. 25878/94, 8 February 2000
Michaud v. France, no. 12323/11, ECHR 2012
Mikolajová v. Slovakia, no. 4479/03, 18 January 2011
Mikulić v. Croatia, no. 53176/99, ECHR 2002-I

Mileva and Others v. Bulgaria, nos. 43449/02 and 21475/04, 25 November 2010
Milka v. Poland, no. 14322/12, 15 September 2015
Mitchell v. the United Kingdom (dec.), no. 40447/98, 24 November 1998
Mitovi v. the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, no. 53565/13, 16 April 2015
Mockutė v. Lithuania, n^o/no. 66490/09, 27 February 2018
Modestou v. Greece, no. 51693/13, 16 March 2017
Moisejevs v. Latvia, no. 64846/01, 15 June 2006
Mokrani v. France, no. 52206/99, 15 July 2003
Moldovan and Others v. Romania (no. 2), nos. 41138/98 and 64320/01, ECHR 2005-VII (extracts)
Mółka v. Poland (dec.), no. 56550/00, 11 April 2006
Monory v. Romania and Hungary, no. 71099/01, 5 April 2005
Moreno Gómez v. Spain, no. 4143/02, ECHR 2004-X
Moretti and Benedetti v. Italy, no. 16318/07, 27 April 2010
Mosley v. the United Kingdom, no. 48009/08, 10 May 2011
Moustaquim v. Belgium, 18 February 1991, Series A no. 193
Mozer v. the Republic of Moldova and Russia [GC], no. 11138/10, ECHR 2016
Mubilanzila Mayeka and Kaniki Mitunga v. Belgium, no. 13178/03, ECHR 2006-XI
Murray v. the United Kingdom, 28 October 1994, Series A no. 300-A
Mustafa and Armağan Akin v. Turkey, no. 4694/03, 6 April 2010
Mutlu v. Turkey, no. 8006/02, 10 October 2006

—N—

Nada v. Switzerland [GC], no. 10593/08, ECHR 2012
Narinen v. Finland, no. 45027/98, 1 June 2004
Nasr and Ghali v. Italy, no. 44883/09, 23 February 2016
National federation of Sportspersons' Associations and unions (FNASS) and Others v. France, nos. 48151/11 and 77769/13, 18 January 2018
Naydyon v. Ukraine, no. 16474/03, 14 October 2010
Nazarenko v. Russia, no. 39438/13, ECHR 2015 (extracts)
Negrepontis-Giannisis v. Greece, no. 56759/08, 3 May 2011
Neulinger and Shuruk v. Switzerland [GC], no. 41615/07, ECHR 2010
Nicklinson and Lamb v. the United Kingdom (dec.), nos. 2478/15 and 1787/15, 23 June 2015
Niedbała v. Poland, no. 27915/95, 4 July 2000
Niemietz v. Germany, 16 December 1992, Series A no. 251-B
Nikowitz and Verlagsgruppe News GmbH v. Austria, no. 5266/03, 22 February 2007
Nitecki v. Poland (dec.), no. 65653/01, 21 March 2002
Noack and Others v. Germany (dec.), no. 46346/99, ECHR 2000-VI
Noveski v. the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia (dec.), nos. 25163/08 and 2 others, 13 September 2016
Novoseletskiy v. Ukraine, 47148/99, ECHR 2005-II (extracts)
Nusret Kaya and Others v. Turkey, nos. 43750/06 and 4 others, 22 April 2014
Nuutinen v. Finland, no. 32842/96, ECHR 2000-VIII
Nylund v. Finland (dec.), no. 27110/95, ECHR 1999-VI

—O—

O. v. the United Kingdom, 8 July 1987, Series A no. 120
Odièvre v. France [GC], no. 42326/98, ECHR 2003-III
Oleksandr Volkov v. Ukraine, no. 21722/11, ECHR 2013
Oleynik v. Russia, no. 23559/07, 21 June 2016
Oliari and Others v. Italy, nos. 18766/11 and 36030/11, 21 July 2015
Olsson v. Sweden (no. 1), 24 March 1988, Series A no. 130

Olsson v. Sweden (no. 2), 27 November 1992, Series A no. 250
Oluić v. Croatia, no. 61260/08, 20 May 2010
Öneryıldız v. Turkey [GC], no. 48939/99, 30 November 2004
Onur v. the United Kingdom, no. 27319/07, 17 February 2009
O'Rourke v. the United Kingdom (dec.), no. 39022/97, 26 June 2001
Orlandi and Others v. Italy, nos. 26431/12 and 3 others, 14 December 2017
Orlić v. Croatia, no. 48833/07, 21 June 2011
Osman v. Denmark, no. 38058/09, 14 June 2011
Osman v. the United Kingdom, 28 October 1998, *Reports of Judgments and Decisions* 1998-VIII
Ospina Vargas v. Italy, no. 40750/98, 14 October 2004
Özpinar v. Turkey, no. 20999/04, 19 October 2010

—P—

P.B. and J.S. v. Austria, no. 18984/02, 22 July 2010
P.G. and J.H. v. the United Kingdom, no. 44787/98, ECHR 2001-IX
P. and S. v. Poland, no. 57375/08, 30 October 2012
Pannullo and Forte v. France, no. 37794/97, ECHR 2001-X
Panteleyenko v. Ukraine, no. 11901/02, 29 June 2006
Pajić v. Croatia, no. 68453/13, 23 February 2016
Palfreeman v. Bulgaria (dec.), no. 59779/14, 16 May 2017
Paposhvili v. Belgium [GC], no. 41738/10, ECHR 2016
Paradiso and Campanelli v. Italy [GC], no. 25358/12, 24 January 2017
Parrillo v. Italy [GC], no. 46470/11, ECHR 2015
Paulić v. Croatia, 3572/06, 22 October 2009
Paulík v. Slovakia, no. 10699/05, ECHR 2006
Peck v. the United Kingdom, no. 44647/98, ECHR 2003-I
Peers v. Greece, no. 28524/95, ECHR 2001-III
Penchevi v. Bulgaria, no. 77818/12, 10 February 2015
Pentiacova and Others v. Moldova (dec.), no. 14462/03, ECHR 2005-I
Perkins and R. v. the United Kingdom, nos. 43208/98 and 44875/98, 22 October 2002
Peruzzo and Martens v. Germany (dec.), nos. 7841/08 and 57900/12, 4 June 2013
Peters v. the Netherlands, no. 21132/93, Commission decision of 6 April 1994
Petri Sallinen and Others v. Finland, no. 50882/99, 27 September 2005
Petrina v. Romania, no. 78060/01, 14 October 2008
Petrov v. Bulgaria, no. 15197/02, 22 May 2008
Petrova v. Latvia, no. 4605/05, 24 June 2014
Petrovic v. Austria, 27 March 1998, *Reports of Judgments and Decisions* 1998-II
Pfeifer v. Austria, no. 12556/03, 15 November 2007
Phinikaridou v. Cyprus, no. 23890/02, 20 December 2007
Pibernik v. Croatia, no. 75139/01, 4 March 2004
Piechowicz v. Poland, no. 20071/07, 17 April 2012
Pihl v. Sweden (dec.), no. 74742/14, 7 February 2017
Pini and Others v. Romania, nos. 78028/01 and 78030/01, ECHR 2004-V (extracts)
Pla and Puncernau v. Andorra, no. 69498/01, ECHR 2004-VIII
Plotki v. Poland, no. 26761/95, 12 November 2002
Polanco Torres and Movilla Polanco v. Spain, no. 34147/06, 21 September 2010
Poleshchuk v. Russia, no. 60776/00, 7 October 2004
Poltoratskiy v. Ukraine, no. 38812/97, 29 April 2003
Polyakova and Others v. Russia, nos. 35090/09 and 3 others, 7 March 2017
Popa v. Romania (dec.), no. 4233/09, 18 June 2013
Popov v. France, nos. 39472/07 and 39474/07, 19 January 2012

Popovi v. Bulgaria, no. 39651/11, 9 June 2016
Posevini v. Bulgaria, no. 63638/14, 19 January 2017
Powell and Rayner v. the United Kingdom, 21 February 1990, Series A no. 172
Prado Bugallo v. Spain, no. 58496/00, 18 February 2003
Pretty v. the United Kingdom, no. 2346/02, ECHR 2002-III
Price v. the United Kingdom, no. 12402/86, Commission decision of 9 March 1988, DR 55
Prokopovich v. Russia, no. 58255/00, ECHR 2004-XI (extracts)
Putistin v. Ukraine, no. 16882/03, 21 November 2013
Puzinas v. Lithuania (no. 2), no. 63767/00, 9 January 2007

—R—

R.B. v. Hungary, no. 64602/12, 12 April 2016
R.C. and V.C. v. France, no. 76491/14, 12 July 2016
R.E. v. the United Kingdom, no. 62498/11, 27 October 2015
R.K. and A.K. v. the United Kingdom, no. 38000/05, 30 September 2008
R.K. and Others v. France, no. 68264/14, 12 July 2016
R.L. and Others v. Denmark, no. 52629/11, 7 March 2017
R.M.S. v. Spain, no. 28775/12, 18 June 2013
R.R. v. Poland, no. 27617/04, ECHR 2011 (extracts)
R.S. v. Poland, no. 63777/09, 21 July 2015
Raban v. Romania, no. 25437/08, 26 October 2010
Rachwalski and Ferenc v. Poland, no. 47709/99, 28 July 2009
Radomilja and Others v. Croatia, nos. 37685/10 and 22768/12, 20 March 2018
Ramadan v. Malta, no. 76136/12, ECHR 2016 (extracts)
Raninen v. Finland, 16 December 1997, *Reports of Judgments and Decisions 1997-VIII*
Rasmussen v. Denmark, 28 November 1984, Series A no. 87
Ratushna v. Ukraine, no. 17318/06, 2 December 2010
Raw and Others v. France, no. 10131/11, 7 March 2013
Rees v. the United Kingdom, 17 October 1986, Series A no. 106
Reklos and Davourlis v. Greece, no. 1234/05, 15 January 2009
Ribić v. Croatia, no. 27148/12, 2 April 2015
Robathin v. Austria, no. 30457/06, 3 July 2012
Roche v. the United Kingdom [GC], no. 32555/96, ECHR 2005-X
Rodrigues da Silva and Hoogkamer v. the Netherlands, no. 50435/99, ECHR 2006-I
Rodzevillo v. Ukraine, no. 38771/05, 14 January 2016
Roemen and Schmit v. Luxembourg, no. 51772/99, 25 September 2003
Roman Zakharov v. Russia [GC], no. 47143/06, ECHR 2015
Rotaru v. Romania [GC], no. 28341/95, ECHR 2000-V
Rouiller v. Switzerland, no. 3592/08, 22 July 2014
Rousk v. Sweden, no. 27183/04, 25 July 2013

—S—

S.A.S. v. France [GC], no. 43835/11, ECHR 2014 (extracts)
Šantare and Labazņikovs v. Latvia, no. 34148/07, 31 March 2016
S. and Marper v. the United Kingdom [GC], nos. 30562/04 and 30566/04, ECHR 2008
S.H. and Others v. Austria [GC], no. 57813/00, ECHR 2011
S.H. v. Italy, no. 52557/14, 13 October 2015
Sabanchiyeva and Others v. Russia, no. 38450/05, 6 June 2013
Sahin v. Germany [GC], no. 30943/96, ECHR 2003-VIII
Şahin Kuş v. Turkey, no. 33160/04, 7 June 2016
Saint-Paul Luxembourg S.A. v. Luxembourg, no. 26419/10, 18 April 2013

Salman v. Turkey [GC], no. 21986/93, ECHR 2000-VII
Salontaji-Drobnjak v. Serbia, no. 36500/05, 13 October 2009
Salvetti v. Italy (dec.), no. 42197/98, 9 July 2002
Sandra Janković v. Croatia, no. 38478/05, 5 March 2009
Santos Nunes v. Portugal, no. 61173/08, 22 May 2012
Sargsyan v. Azerbaijan [GC], no. 40167/06, ECHR 2015
Sarumi v. the United Kingdom (dec.), no. 43279/98, 26 January 1999
Satakunnan Markkinapörssi Oy and Satamedia Oy v. Finland [GC], no. 931/13, ECHR 2017 (extracts)
Saviny v. Ukraine, no. 39948/06, 18 December 2008
Sayoud v. France, no. 70456/01, 26 July 2007
Schalk and Kopf v. Austria, no. 30141/04, ECHR 2010
Schönenberger and Durmaz v. Switzerland, 20 June 1988, Series A no. 137
Sciacca v. Italy, no. 50774/99, ECHR 2005-I
Schlumpf v. Switzerland, no. 29002/06, 8 January 2009
Scozzari and Giunta v. Italy [GC], nos. 39221/98 and 41963/98, ECHR 2000-VIII
Segerstedt-Wiberg and Others v. Sweden, no. 62332/00, ECHR 2006-VII
Selçuk and Asker v. Turkey, 24 April 1998, *Reports of Judgments and Decisions* 1998-II
Sen v. the Netherlands, no. 31465/96, 21 December 2001
Sentges v. the Netherlands (dec.), no. 27677/02, 8 July 2003
Serçe v. Romania, no. 35049/08, 30 June 2015.
Şerife Yiğit v. Turkey [GC], no. 3976/05, 2 November 2010
Sérvulo & Associados Sociedade de Advogados, RL and Others v. Portugal, no. 27013/10, 3 September 2015
Sevastyanov v. Russia, no. 37024/02, 22 April 2010
Shavdarov v. Bulgaria, no. 3465/03, 21 December 2010
Shchebetov v. Russia, no. 21731/02, 10 April 2012
Sheffield and Horsham v. the United Kingdom, 30 July 1998, *Reports of Judgments and Decisions* 1998-V
Shelley v. the United Kingdom (dec.), no. 23800/06, 4 January 2008
Shebashov v. Latvia (dec.), no. 50065/99, 9 November 2000
Sher and Others v. the United Kingdom, no. 5201/11, 20 October 2015
Shimovolov v. Russia, no. 30194/09, 21 June 2011
Shofman v. Russia, no. 74826/01, 24 November 2005
Shopov v. Bulgaria, no. 11373/04, 2 September 2010
Shtukaturov v. Russia, no. 44009/05, ECHR 2008
Sidabras and Džiautas v. Lithuania, nos. 55480/00 and 59330/00, ECHR 2004-VIII
Silver and Others v. the United Kingdom, 25 March 1983, Series A no. 61
Siskina and Siskins v. Latvia (dec.), no. 59727/00, 8 November 2001
Slivenko v. Latvia [GC], no. 48321/99, ECHR 2003-X
Slivenko and Others v. Latvia (dec.) [GC], no. 48321/99, ECHR 2002-II (extracts)
Smirnov v. Russia, no. 71362/01, 7 June 2007
Smirnova v. Russia, nos. 46133/99 and 48183/99, ECHR 2003-IX (extracts)
Smith and Grady v. the United Kingdom, nos. 33985/96 and 33986/96, ECHR 1999-VI
Soares de Melo v. Portugal, no. 72850/14, 16 February 2016
Société Canal Plus and Others v. France, no. 29408/08, 21 December 2010
Société Colas Est and Others v. France, no. 37971/97, 16 April 2002.
Sodan v. Turkey, no. 18650/05, 2 February 2016
Söderman v. Sweden [GC], no. 5786/08, ECHR 2013
Solomon v. the Netherlands (dec.), no. 44328/98, 5 September 2000
Sommerfeld v. Germany [GC], no. 31871/96, ECHR 2003-VIII (extracts)
Sõro v. Estonia, no. 22588/08, 3 September 2015

Sousa Goucha v. Portugal, no. 70434/12, 22 March 2016
Spyra and Kranczkowski v. Poland, no. 19764/07, 25 September 2012
Steeg v. Germany (dec.), nos. 9676/05 and 2 others, 3 June 2008
Stenegry and Adam v. France (dec.), no. 40987/05, 22 May 2007
Stjerna v. Finland, 25 November 1994, Series A no. 299-B
Storck v. Germany, no. 61603/00, ECHR 2005-V
Strömblad v. Sweden, no. 3684/07, 5 April 2012
Strumia v. Italy, no. 53377/13, 23 June 2016
Strunjak and Others v. Croatia (dec.), no. 46934/99, ECHR 2000-X
Stübing v. Germany, no. 43547/08, 12 April 2012
Surikov v. Ukraine, no. 42788/06, 26 January 2017
Surugiu v. Romania, no. 48995/99, 20 April 2004
Süß v. Germany, no. 40324/98, 10 November 2005
Szabó and Vissy v. Hungary, no. 37138/14, 12 January 2016
Szafrański v. Poland, no. 17249/12, 15 December 2015
Szula v. the United Kingdom (dec.), no. 18727/06, 4 January 2007
Szuluk v. the United Kingdom, no. 36936/05, ECHR 2009

—T—

T.P. and K.M. v. the United Kingdom [GC], no. 28945/95, ECHR 2001-V (extracts)
Taddeucci and McCall v. Italy, no. 51362/09, 30 June 2016
Tamiz v. the United Kingdom (dec.), no. 3877/14, 19 September 2017
Tamosius v. the United Kingdom (dec.), no. 62002/00, ECHR 2002-VIII
Tanda-Muzinga v. France, no. 2260/10, 10 July 2014
Tapia Gasca and D. v. Spain, no. 20272/06, 22 December 2009
Taşkın and Others v. Turkey, no. 46117/99, ECHR 2004-X
Tătar v. Romania, no. 67021/01, 27 January 2009
Taylor-Sabori v. the United Kingdom, no. 47114/99, 22 October 2002
Telegraaf Media Nederland Landelijke Media B.V. and Others v. the Netherlands, no. 39315/06, 22 November 2012
Ternovszky v. Hungary, no. 67545/09, 14 December 2010
Tiğ v. Turkey (dec.), no. 8165/03, 24 May 2005
Tlapak and Others v. Germany, no. 11308/16 and 11344/16, 22 March 2018
Toma v. Romania, no. 42716/02, 24 February 2009
Topčić-Rosenberg v. Croatia, no. 19391/11, 14 November 2013
Touroude v. France (dec.), no. 35502/97, 3 October 2000
Tsonyo Tsonov v. Bulgaria, no. 33726/03, 1 October 2009
Tsvetelin Petkov v. Bulgaria, no. 2641/06, 15 July 2014
Turek v. Slovakia, no. 57986/00, ECHR 2006-II (extracts)
Tysiqc v. Poland, no. 5410/03, ECHR 2007-I

—U—

Udeh v. Switzerland, no. 12020/09, 16 April 2013
Udovičić v. Croatia, no. 27310/09, 24 April 2014
Ünal Tekeli v. Turkey, no. 29865/96, ECHR 2004-X (extracts)
Üner v. the Netherlands [GC], no. 46410/99, ECHR 2006-XII
Ustyantsev v. Ukraine, no. 3299/05, 12 January 2012
Uzun v. Germany, no. 35623/05, ECHR 2010 (extracts)

—V—

V.C. v. Slovakia, no. 18968/07, ECHR 2011 (extracts)
V.P. v. Russia, no. 61362/12, 23 October 2014
Valašinas v. Lithuania, no. 44558/98, ECHR 2001-VIII
Vallianatos and Others v. Greece [GC], nos. 29381/09 and 32684/09, ECHR 2013 (extracts)
Valenzuela Contreras v. Spain, 30 July 1998, *Reports of Judgments and Decisions* 1998-V
Van der Heijden v. the Netherlands [GC], no. 42857/05, 3 April 2012
Van der Velden v. the Netherlands (dec.), no. 29514/05, ECHR 2006-XV
Van der Ven v. the Netherlands, no. 50901/99, ECHR 2003-II
Van Kuck v. Germany, no. 35968/97, 12 June 2003
Van Rossem v. Belgium, no. 41872/98, 9 December 2004
Van Vondel v. the Netherlands, no. 38258/03, 25 October 2007
Varga v. Romania, no. 73957/01, 1 April 2008
Vasileva v. Bulgaria, no. 23796/10, 17 March 2016
Vasiliy Ivashchenko v. Ukraine, no. 760/03, 26 July 2012
Vasylichuk v. Ukraine, no. 24402/07, 13 June 2013
Versini-Campinchi and Crasnianski v. France, no. 49176/11, 16 June 2016
Vidish v. Russia, no. 53120/08, 15 March 2016
Vilnes and Others v. Norway, nos. 52806/09 and 22703/10, 5 December 2013
Vinci Construction and GTM Génie Civil et Services v. France, nos. 63629/10 and 60567/10, 2 April 2015
Vintman v. Ukraine, no. 28403/05, 23 October 2014
Vlasov v. Russia, no. 78146/01, 12 June 2008
Von Hannover v. Germany (no. 2) [GC], nos. 40660/08 and 60641/08, ECHR 2012
Vorozhba v. Russia, no. 57960/11, 16 October 2014
Vrzić v. Croatia, no. 43777/13, 12 July 2016
Vukota-Bojić v. Switzerland, no. 61838/10, 18 October 2016

—W—

W. v. the Netherlands (dec.), no. 20689/08, 20 January 2009
W. v. the United Kingdom, 8 July 1987, Series A no. 121
Wagner and J.M.W.L. v. Luxembourg, no. 76240/01, 28 June 2007
Wainwright v. the United Kingdom, no. 12350/04, ECHR 2006-X
Wakefield v. the United Kingdom, no. 15817/89, Commission decision of 1 October 1990, DR 66
Walkuska v. Poland (dec.), no. 6817/09, 29 April 2008
Wallová and Walla v. the Czech Republic, no. 23848/04, 26 October 2006
Ward v. the United Kingdom (dec.), no. 31888/03, 9 November 2004
Weber and Saravia v. Germany (dec.), no. 54934/00, ECHR 2006-XI
Welsh and Silva Canha v. Portugal, no. 16812/11, 17 September 2013
Wetjen and Others v. Germany, nos. 68125/14 and 72204/14, 22 March 2018
Wieser and Bicos Beteiligungen GmbH v. Austria, no. 74336/01, 16 October 2007
William Faulkner v. the United Kingdom, no. 37471/97, 4 June 2002
Winterstein and Others v. France, no. 27013/07, 17 October 2013
Wisse v. France, no. 71611/01, 20 December 2005
Wolland v. Norway, no. 39731/12, 17 May 2018

—X—

X and Others v. Austria [GC], no. 19010/07, ECHR 2013
X and Y v. Belgium, no. 8962/80, Commission decision of 13 May 1982, DR 28
X and Y v. the Netherlands, 26 March 1985, Series A no. 91

X v. Austria, no. 8278/78, Commission decision of 13 December 1979, DR 154
X v. Latvia [GC], no. 27853/09, ECHR 2013
X v. the United Kingdom, no. 7308/75, Commission decision of 12 October 1978, DR 16
X, Y and Z v. the United Kingdom, 22 April 1997, *Reports of Judgments and Decisions* 1997-II
X. v. Finland, no. 34806/04, 3 July 2012
X. v. France no. 9993/82, Commission decision of 5 October 1982, DR 31
X. v. Iceland, no. 6825/74, Commission decision of 18 May 1976, DR 5
Xavier Da Silveira v. France, no. 43757/05, 21 January 2010

—Y—

Y.C. v. the United Kingdom, no. 4547/10, 13 March 2012
Y.F. v. Turkey, no. 24209/94, ECHR 2003-IX
Y. v. Slovenia, no. 41107/10, ECHR 2015 (extracts)
Y. v. Turkey (dec.), no. 648/10, 17 February 2015
Y.Y. v. Turkey, no. 14793/08, ECHR 2015 (extracts)
Yefimenko v. Russia, no. 152/04, 12 February 2013
Yildirim v. Austria (dec.), no. 34308/96, 19 October 1999
Yonchev v. Bulgaria, no. 12504/09, 7 December 2017
Yordanova and Others v. Bulgaria, no. 25446/06, 24 April 2012

—Z—

Z v. Finland, 25 February 1997, *Reports of Judgments and Decisions* 1997-I
Z and Others v. the United Kingdom [GC], no. 29392/95, ECHR 2001-V
Z.H. and R.H. v. Switzerland, no. 60119/12, 8 December 2015
Zaieț v. Romania, no. 44958/05, 24 March 2015
Zammit Maempel v. Malta, no. 24202/10, 22 November 2011
Zehentner v. Austria, no. 20082/02, 16 July 2009
Zehnalova and Zehnal v. the Czech Republic (dec.), no. 38621/97, 14 May 2002
Zhou v. Italy, no. 33773/11, 21 January 2014
Znamenskaya v. Russia, no. 77785/01, 2 June 2005
Zorica Jovanović v. Serbia, no. 21794/08, ECHR 2013
Zubaľ v. Slovakia, no. 44065/06, 9 November 2010