## TABLE OF CONTENTS

27.131900.730 11443

Preface	BINGSHIELD MARKE	THE TRUCCULARGER	E ET	vii
A Note	on Citation	Transition of the marks of the contractions	SIT.	xi
Acknou	rledgements			xxiii
Table of	Cases before the European Commis		1	XXV
	Cases before the European Court of			xxvi
Table of	Cases from the United States			$\mathbf{x}1$
Table of	Cases from Canada	Webliton v Blorbins	. F	xlv
Table of	Cases from the United Kingdom	Rationder 16 Fillschauff		xlvii
Table of	Other Cases	throw out to your file	5117	1
Table of	Statutes	garaine garainesM	. 1	li
Table of	International Instruments	Familia institute yaraffil.		lv
111		in variation and that grandefinite	.E	
A. B. C.	Human rights law  The negotiation of the Convention  The progress of the Convention	3300.19 N 111	d W	4
2 STR	ASBOURG'S LEGAL MACE	IINERY		24
	The European Commission of H		. [	24
В.	Admissibility	activitie over seites out		27
	1. Earl Spencer's case	mee boo gainnaig ni abetsir		30
683	2. Exhaustion of domestic remed	lies		36
	3. The Icelandic Electoral System			38
	4. Manifestly ill-founded			41
	5 The Banković case	1129Var ok rol 5991 5.1		42
EE1.	6. Strasbourg's jurisdiction	d Lemma or emphantination	201	47
C.	Friendly settlement	mobautil boint a chiewhi		49
159	1. The Giama case	annitagaldo eritin ametas erit		50
191	2. Negotiations at Strasbourg	V11507:7 111696:		55

F. Exct-linding in the European Court of Eluman Fights

163

D.	Fact-finding	57
	1. The Greek case	57
	2. Shame at Strasbourg	65
3 TH	IE EUROPEAN COURT OF HUMAN RIGHTS	69
/		70
A. B.		74
VXX	The role of the Court  1. The Sunday Times v. United Kingdom	
ivxx		
C.		
	1. Barthold v. Germany  2. Demodice at Streebourg	
iiviy		
D.		103
		103
vi	2. Efficacy and legitimacy  Streebourg and the efficacy of international law.	109
	3. Strasbourg and the efficacy of international law	111
Α.	When does 'life' begin?	120
4 TH	IE RIGHT TO LIFE	119
A.		
01	1. Vo v. France	120
	2. The extent of Article 2	128
В.	State obligations under Article 2	
24	1. Gülv. Turkey sanga anamel la masamasi a associated	
7.7	2. Excessive use of force	
	<ul><li>Defects in planning and control</li><li>a. McCann and Others v. United Kingdom</li></ul>	138 138
36	a. McCann and Others v. United Kingdom  b. Judicial review of public safety decisions	146
38	4. The duty to investigate	147
	hadronel de vite et la vite et la	L
547	a. R. (Amin) v. Secretary of State for the Home Departme	111 11/
C.	<ul> <li>a. R. (Amin) v. Secretary of State for the Home Departme</li> <li>b. The need for an investigation</li> </ul>	152
F. V	b. The need for an investigation  Positive obligations to protect life	152 153
	b. The need for an investigation  Positive obligations to protect life  1. Edwards v. United Kingdom	152 153
0.8	<ul> <li>b. The need for an investigation</li> <li>Positive obligations to protect life</li> <li>1. Edwards v. United Kingdom</li> <li>2. The extent of the obligations</li> </ul>	152 153
	b. The need for an investigation  Positive obligations to protect life  1. Edwards v. United Kingdom	152 153 154

	RTURE; INHUMAN OR DEG PUNISHMENT; AND SLAVE		T 168
Α.	Defining the terms	Literature research du autilité	170
	1. Ireland v. United Kingdom		170
	2. Peers v. Greece		178
	3. Judicial distinctions		181
	4. Fact-finding under Article 3		192
	5. Comparisons		194
	6. The United Nations Convention interrogation		202
В.	Corporal punishment		206
	1. Tyrer v. United Kingdom	Bullion of the State of the Sta	206
	2. Degrading treatment	garder-design	209
	3. Public opinion	rolans tilling hrivingstensister	213
C.	Extradition, expulsion or deportat	tion	215
	1. The responsibility of the deport	ing state	215
115	2. D. v. United Kingdom		220
	3. The U.N. Refugee Convention		226
D.	The death penalty	ON OF THOUSAND.	227
E.	Article 4: Slavery and forced labou	ir inamebulahan	230
6 FRI	EEDOM OF EXPRESSION; AS	SSOCIATION	234
A.	Introduction	'moigilen' le nathade	235
B.	Justifying limits on expression	unitalvinas manta and	236
	1. Handyside v. United Kingdom	multiplia bazinia vyusini	237
	2. The justification of interference	s with Convention rights	242
	a. Proportionality and the r	nargin of appreciation	242
	b. Comparisons		244
	c. Levels of justification	1.1. 01.1.7.4	249
247		and the relativity of value y and impartiality of the judic	249 iary 252
	e. Maintaining the authorit f. The nature of the violatio		252 253
	3. Comparisons	sal-vit / midel	253
C.	Categories of expression	Francesching automilian	256
	1. Political expression	THE THE PARTY OF THE BUILDING AND	256
	•	CTEUR PRIVATE, AN	256
	c. The special protection of	political expression and the pr	
	d. Free expression and the ju	udicial process	264

103

	3. Freedom of expression and protection against defamation	268
	a. Defamation and matters of public interest	268
	I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I	271
		274
0.0	d. Sanctions for defamation	276
873	4. Freedom of expression and national security	278
183	5. Hate speech and blasphemy	282
	a. Witzsch v. Germany	282
101		284
	6. Commercial speech	290
SUS	a. Markt Intern and Beermann v. Germany	290
	b. Comparisons	296
	7. Artistic expression	300
201	8. Broadcasting	301
D.	Expression and public employment	305
E.	Interferences 'prescribed by law'	309
F.	Prior restraints	313
G.	Article 11: Freedom of association	314
3	remayon Cabhiga Lair I	
7 FRE	EEDOM OF THOUGHT, CONSCIENCE AND RELIGION	323
A.	The landmark judgment	323
	1. Kokkinakis v. Greece	323
	2. Waiting for Article 9	333
В.	The definition of 'religion'	335
055	1. Buscarini v. San Marino	335
	2. Pretty v. United Kingdom	337
212	3. The failure to define	338
C.C.	The freedom to manifest one's religion	340
		340
249	2 Article 10 or Article 9?	347
249	DIMPA TO ATLAURIST DUE PRESENTATIONS TO HORODOLOGICAL	348
253		356
253		362
425		368
		371
251/		
8 RES	SPECT FOR PRIVATE AND FAMILY LIFE; MARRIAGE	373
SasA.	The scope of family and private life	373

and the expression and the judicial products.

В.	Fam	ily life	375
	1.	Johnston v. Ireland	375
	2.	The definition of the family	380
	3.	Positive obligations	389
384		a. X and Y v. The Netherlands	389
		b. The reach of positive obligations	391
1015	4.	Aspects of family life	403
101		a. The home	403
V.		b. Language rights	405
		c. Immigration and deportation d. Gül v. Switzerland	407
		Damantal michta	417
500	Drive	. 1.0	
O.C.	FIIV		421
1)7	1.	Dudgeon v. United Kingdom	421
	2.	The definition of 'private life'	
(1)?	3.	Private acts and the protection of morals	428
ic	4.	Private life and sexual preferences	430
	5.	Privacy rights and abortion	435
D.	Priv	ate life and personal identity	437
16	1.	Sexual identity	437
52		<ul> <li>a. Christine Goodwin v. United Kingdom</li> <li>b. Personal identity and gender re-assignment</li> </ul>	437 442
	2.	Article 12 and the right to marry	443
		a. Christine Goodwin v. United Kingdom	443
		b. Restrictions on marriage	445
52	3.	Personal identity and choice of name	447
E.	Publ	lic disclosure or investigation of private information	448
TH	E RI	GHT TO FREEDOM FROM DISCRIMINATION	457
A.	The	'parasitic' quality of Article 14	457
EC	1.	Abdulaziz v. United Kingdom	458
	2.	Gaygusuz v. Austria	464
88	3.	R. (Carson) v. Secretary of State for Work and Pensions	466
1-2	4.	Botta v. Italy	468
В.	The	protected grounds	470
	1.	R. (Clift and Others) v. Secretary of State for the Home Departmen	nt 471
C.	'Disc	crimination': the role of comparison	474
the?	1	Fredin v. Sweden	474
P.T	2	Van der Mussele v. Belgium	477
	4.	valiation v. Deigiani	1//

TABLE OF CONTENTS

xvii

	3. Loving v. Virginia	481
	4. Paulik v. Slovakia	484
D.	Indirect discrimination	485
0.00	1. Griggs v. Duke Power Co.	486
0.87	2. Thlimmenos v. Greece	488
E.	Proving discrimination	489
	1. DH and others v. Czech Republic	490
7 M 1	2. Nachova and others v. Bulgaria	493
F.	The justification of differential treatment	497
	1. Introduction	497
1.4-	2. Palmore v. Sidoti	500
	3. Petrovic v. Austria	503
	4. Fretté v. France	505
G.	'Positive' discrimination	506
	1. Grutter v. Bollinger	508
DEF	2. Stec and Others v. United Kingdom	512
H.		516
3	Livine file and personal identity	
10 PR	OPERTY	519
Α.	Determining whether there has been an 'interference'	521
	1. The Court's general approach in property cases	521
-64-4-	2. Sporrong and Lönnroth v. Sweden	521
	3. The meaning of 'property' for the purposes of the guarantee	525
	4. Interferences with property rights: the three rules	528
	a. The first rule: peaceful enjoyment of property	528
	b. The second rule: deprivation of property	529
	c. The third rule: control over the use of property	529
	5. Pine Valley Developments Ltd and Others v. Ireland	530
	6. Tre Traktörer Aktiebolag v. Sweden	531
	7. Gasus Dosier-und Födertechnik v. Netherlands	533
В.	Assessing whether an interference is justified: legal certainty and the public interest	539
3.55		540
A STATE OF	1. The requirement of lawfulness  2. Determining the 'general' or 'public' interest for an	340
	2. Determining the 'general' or 'public' interest for an interference with property rights	541
174	interference with property rights  3. James and Others v. United Kingdom	542
1-16-	4. Stran Greek Refineries and Stratis Andreadis v. Greece	546
	5. Beyeler v. Italy	549
1000	The desired and the second of	

		TABLE OF CONTENTS	xix
	C.	Assessing whether an interference is justified: proportionality	553
		1. Lithgow and Others v. United Kingdom	555
		2. Jahn and Others v. Germany	560
	2	Life or circular over quality and the restaurable to a some	
11.	THI	E RIGHT TO EDUCATION	568
di)	A.	Introduction	568
	В.	The Belgian Linguistic case (No. 2)	570
	C.	Kjeldsen, Busk Madsen and Pedersen v. Denmark	574
	D.	Campbell and Cosans v. United Kingdom	581
	E.	Valsamis v. Greece	588
	F.	Sahin v. Turkey	592
	G.	Some consequences of the Convention right to education	597
5		Some consequences of the Convention right to caucation	371
12	THI	E RIGHT TO LIBERTY AND SECURITY OF PERSON	601
3/1	Α.	Introduction (Carallela de Vingerorg lo grimmer aff	602
		1. Kurt v. Turkey	602
		2. Cyprus v. Turkey	605
	B.	Has there been a deprivation of liberty?	610
(4)2		1. Guzzardi v. Italy	610
264		2. Engel and Others v. The Netherlands	614
		3. H.M. v. Switzerland	618
	C.	Detention after conviction	621
		Van Droogenbroeck v. Belgium	622
FUE		2. Weeks v. United Kingdom  Thypna Wilson and Cunnell v. United Kingdom	624
		3. Thynne, Wilson and Gunnell v. United Kingdom	628
		4. Stafford v. United Kingdom	632
	D.	Detention of mental patients	639
		1. Winterwerp v. The Netherlands	639
		2. X v. United Kingdom	643
		3. Johnson v. United Kingdom	646
	E.	Other permitted grounds of detention	651
15.00		1. Lawful arrest or detention on reasonable suspicion of	
		having committed an offence	651
715.		a. Loukanov v. Bulgaria	653
		b. Steel and Others v. United Kingdom	655
112		c. Fox, Campbell and Hartley v. United Kingdom d. Jablonski v. Poland	658 661

	2.	Arrest or detention to secure the fulfilment of	
		an obligation prescribed by law	664
		a. Benham v. United Kingdom	664
	3.	Arrest or detention for the prevention of the	
		spreading of infectious diseases	666
568		a. Enhorn v. Sweden	666
	4.	Arrest or detention to prevent an unauthorized entry into the country or with a view to deportation or extradition  a. Amuur v. France	670
		a. Amuur v. France	670
		<ul><li>b. Conka v. Belgium</li><li>c. Chahal v. United Kingdom</li></ul>	673
3886	D · 1		0//
TOP F.	_	nt to be brought promptly before a judge or other officer norized to exercise judicial power	681
	1.	Who may exercise judicial power for the purposes of Article 5(3)?	681
100		a. Huber v. Switzerland	682
200	2.	The meaning of 'promptly' in Article 5(3)	685
CG-		a. Brogan v. United Kingdom	686
G.	The	right to a decision by a court as to	
	the l	legality of detention Sanchez-Reisse v. Switzerland	690
010	1.	CONTRACTOR LIGHTOOF IS CONTRACTOR	692
010	2.	Bouamar v. Belgium Megveri v. Germany	695
	3.	1110m   VIII   V V V V V V V V V V V V V V V	698
H.	The	challenge of terrorism and the right of es to derogate from the Convention	702
5.50	1.	Lawless v. Republic of Ireland (No. 3)	703
255	2.	The sequel to Brogan v. United Kingdom	706
850	3.	Brannigan v. United Kingdom	706
632	4.	Aksoy v. Turkey	712
	5.	Habeas corpus in emergency situations	715
200		Winterworp v. the Natherlands	
13 TH	E RI	GHT TO A FAIR AND PUBLIC HEARING	718
A.	Intro	oduction mobility and and a	718
В.	Crin	ninal charges and civil rights	720
	1.	Öztürk v. Germany	721
129	2.	Benham v. United Kingdom	725
8.00	3.	When has a criminal charge been determined?	726
8604	4.	Do disciplinary and other punitive procedures involve the determination of criminal charges?	730

8.4.5	5.	Campbell and Fells v. United Kingdom	731
	6.	Civil rights and public rights	738
85	7.	Feldbrugge v. The Netherlands	745
859	8.	Employment in the public service	755
28	9.	Eskelinen v. Finland	756
17.0	10.	Further aspects of the scope of Article 6(1)	762
8 C.	Ani	independent and impartial tribunal	766
	1.	Piersack v. Belgium	766
8,64	2.	The problem of prior involvement	769
	3.	Sigurdsson v. Iceland	776
	4.	Objective impartiality	781
268	5.	Independence	783
365	6.	Administrative agencies and disciplinary bodies	787
D.	Equ	ality of arms	792
	1.	Dombo Beheer B.V. v. The Netherlands	793
871	2.	Aspects of equality	797
875	3.	R. (Roberts) v. Parole Board and Another	799
17.8	4.	The right to confront witnesses	807
88	5.	The right to counsel	812
		a. Granger v. United Kingdom	812
88 E.	The	requirements of prompt adjudication	816
88		Win to de arrors conge and compliances	. 1
4 TH	EEF	III THE IMPACT OF THE STRASBOURG SYSTEM FECT IN NATIONAL LAW OF THE EUROPEAN NTION ON HUMAN RIGHTS	M 829
Α.	The	diverse legal systems in Europe	829
В.	The in n	duty of states to give effect to the Convention ational law	831
	1.	Does the Convention require states (a) to give direct effect in national law to the substantive rights protected by the Convention	
26		a. Klass v. Germany	834
		b. Silver v. United Kingdom	837
		c. Chahal v. United Kingdom	842
	2.	Is it the duty of a state to comply with remedial measures	
		required following a breach of the Convention?	845
		a. Vermeire v. Belgium	846

TABLE OF CONTENTS

33.

348

C.	Inco	rporation of the Convention—the practice of states		849
D.	The	effect of the Convention in the law of the United Kingdor	n	854
	1.	Malone v. Metropolitan Police Commissioner		855
	2.	R. v. Secretary of State for the Home Department, ex parte Bri	nd	856
	3.	Giving effect to the Convention in United Kingdom law	.9.	859
8.07		a. Rights brought home: the Human Rights Bill		859
766	4.	The Human Rights Act 1998	i. O	864
	5.	The duty to interpret legislation in accordance	. 1	
Cit		with the Convention	. 5	866
				866
187	6.	Judicial review of legislation that is inconsistent	1.	0.00
		with the Convention		869
		a. A v. Secretary of State for the Home Department		869
E.	The 1	relation between the Convention and Community law		873
7.93		Dombo Belieur B.V. v. The Neitherlands	1	070
15 PK		MS AND PROSPECTS		878
A.	Wha	t to do about case load and coherence?	8	878
807	1.	The flood of applications	ł.	879
	2.	A victim of its own success?		881
SIK	3.	Pilot judgments		883
816	4.	Coping with the case load and coherence		884
B.	Wha	t to do about coverage and compliance?		885
	1.72	Extending the rights protected	PAT	885
	2.	Adding the European Union		886
	3.	Implementing judgments	ahr	889
829	4.	Addressing systemic violations of the Convention	CON	895
(15. K	5.	Improving coverage and compliance		896
		Convention for the Protection of and Fundamental Freedoms	I . &	899
APPEN	DIX B	Proposed Protocol 14 to the Convention		927
		The Human Rights Act 1998 (United Kingdom)		934
Index		individuals to remedy breaches of those Convention right		951
2.7.2		70 mm 2 0 0 2251 4		

Is at the duty of a sate to comply with remedial measures required following a breach of the Convenien of

in briver : United kingdom

mobaria beinul - ladado 5

a. Vermeire v. Seignun