

FOR YOUR RIGHTS: TOWARDS EUROPEAN STANDARDS



#### INTRODUCTION TO THE EUROPEAN CONVENTION ON HUMAN RIGHTS – MAIN PRINCIPLES

Jeremy McBride

Barrister, Monckton Chambers, London

Funded by the European Union and the Council of Europe



Implemented by the Council of Europe



FOR YOUR RIGHTS: TOWARDS EUROPEAN STANDARDS

- The role of the Court
- An approach shaped by:
- not being a fourth instance
  - Dimitar Yordanov v. Bulgaria, no. 3401/09, 6 September 2018
- - the principle of subsidiarity
  - Sergey Zolotukhin v. Russia [GC], no. 14939/03, 10 February 2009
- - the margin of appreciation
  - *Hirst v. the United Kingdom* (no. 2) [GC], no. 74025/01, 6 October 2005
  - Dickson v. United Kingdom [GC], no. 44362/04, 4 December 2007

by the European Union and the Council of Europe



Implemented by the Council of Europe



- The text of the Convention
- It is important to keep in mind that:
- - provisions have an autonomous meaning
  - Anheuser-Busch Inc. v. Portugal [GC], no. 73049/01, 11 January 2007
  - G.I.E.M. S.r.I. and Others v. Italy [GC], no. 1828/06, 28 June 2018
- - it is a bilingual text
  - Perinçek v. Switzerland [GC], no. 27510/08, 15 October 2015
- - provisions are not to be viewed in isolation
  - Osmanoğlu and Kocabaş v. Switzerland, no. 29086/12, 10 January 2017



- The term "Law"
- The rule of law requires:
- - rules of general application
- - observance of the rules in practice
- - effective supervision over the application of the rules
- The need to meet certain quality requirements:
- - accessibility
- *Silver v. United Kingdom*, no. 5947/72, 25 March 1983
- - foreseeability
- *Maestri . Italy* [GC], no. 39748/98, 17 February 2004
- - precision in the scope of powers
- - Rotaru v. Romania [GC], no. 28341/95, 4 May 2000



FOR YOUR RIGHTS: TOWARDS EUROPEAN STANDARDS

- Also decision-making should not be arbitrary
  - *S., V. and A. v. Denmark* [G], no. 35553/12, 22 October 2018 ٠
- The nature of the rights and duties
- The rights fall into four broad categories:
- those which are absolute
- those subject to a range of more broadly stated competing interests
- those subject to very specific limitations
- those for which no limitations are specified but with implied
  - Rowe and Davis v. United Kingdom [GC], no. 28901/95, 16
  - Ahmed and Others v. United Kingdom, no. 22954/93, 2

limitations

February 2000

September 1998



FOR YOUR RIGHTS: TOWARDS EUROPEAN STANDARDS

The existence of implied rights

- *Golder v. United Kingdom* [P], no. 4451/70, 21 February 1975
- *Saunders v. United Kingdom* [GC], no. 19187/91, 17 December 1996
- and positive obligations for the State
  - *A. v. United Kingdom,* no. 55599/94, 23 September 1998
  - *Hämäläinen v. Finland* [GC], no. 37359/09, 16 July 2014
  - *O'Keeffe v. Ireland* [GC], no. 35810/09, 28 January 2014



- Vinter and Others v. United Kingdom [GC], no. 66069/09, 9 July 2013
- Lautsi and Others v. Italy [GC], no. 30814/06, 18 March 2011
- as well as certain procedural obligations
  - *Baltiņš v. Latvia*, no. 25282/07, 8 January 2013
- and rights that are non-derogable and not subject to reciprocity
  - Ireland v. United Kingdom [P], no. 5310/71, 18 January 1978



- Interpreting the Convention
- This is based on:
- the ordinary meaning of the words used
  - Hirsi Jamaa and Others v. Italy [GC], no. 27765/09, 23 February 2012
- the object and purpose
  - Soering v. United Kingdom [P], no. 14038/88, 7 July 1989
- being practical and effective
  - Golder v. United Kingdom [P], no. 4451/70, 21 February 1975
- not being literal
  - Scoppola v. Italy (No. 2) [GC], no. 10249/03, 17 September 2009



- maintaining and promoting democracy
- Refah Partisi (the Welfare Party) and Others v. Turkey [GC], no. 41340/98, 13 February 2003
- being a living instrument
  - Ferrazzini v. Italy [GC], no. 44759/98, 12 July 2001
- not ignoring deliberate omissions
  - Johnston and Others v. Ireland [P], no. 9697/82, 18 December 1986
- being alert to the need for a change in approach
  - Stubbings and Others v. United Kingdom, no. 22083/93, 22 October 1996
- the importance of a European consensus
  - Dudgeon v. United Kingdom [P], no. 7525/76, 22 October 1981
  - *Bayatyan v. Armenia* [GC], no. 23459/03, 7 July 2011



- Bryan v. United Kingdom, no. 19178/91, 22 November 1995
- A., B. and C. v. Ireland [GC], no. 25579/05, 16 November 2010
- *V. v. United Kingdom* [GC], no. 24888/94, 16 December 1999
- the absence of a rigid doctrine of precedent
- Demir and Baykara v. Turkey [GC], no. 34503/97, 12 November 2008
- - a readiness to clarify rulings
  - *Schatschaschwili v. Germany* [GC], no. 9154/10, 15 December 2015



- Striking of a fair balance between the rights and freedoms
- Where there is a restriction on a right or freedom, the Court considers whether:
- - a legitimate aim is being pursued
- *Khuzhin and Others v. Russia*, no. 13470/02, 23 October 2008
- - there are relevant and sufficient reasons for the restrictions
- *Wille v. Liechtenstein* [GC], no. 28396/95, 28 October 1999



- there is proportionality in the means being used to pursue
- *Hertel v. Switzerland*, no. 25181/94, 25 August 1998
- De Haes and Gijsels v. Belgium, no. 19983/92, 24 February 1997
- *Lehideux and Isorni v. France* [GC], no. 24662/94, 23 September 1998
- *Immobiliare Saffi v. Italy* [GC], no. 22774/93, 28 July 1999
- *Ceylan v. Turkey* [GC], no. 23556/94, 8 July 1999
- *Christine Goodwin v. United Kingdom* [GC], no. 28957/95, 11 July 2002