

Immunities and the Right of
Access to Court under Article 6
of the European Convention on
Human Rights

By
Matthias Kloth

MARTINUS

NIJHOFF

PUBLISHERS

LEIDEN • BOSTON
2010

Contents

Preface	xiii
Abbreviations	xv
Part I: Introduction	1
I. The scope and objective of this work	1
II. The right of access to court under Article 6 (1) of the Convention: the case of <i>Golder v. the United Kingdom</i>	2
III. The meaning of “civil rights and obligations”	6
1. The “civil” character of a right under Article 6 (1)	6
2. “Civil rights” regarding employment disputes in foreign embassies or international organisations	7
a) The case-law of the Court	7
b) Conclusion	10
3. The meaning of the term “right”	11
IV. The “Ashingdane Test”	13
1. Legitimate Aim	13
2. Proportionality	15
a) The margin of appreciation	16
b) A margin of appreciation regarding the application of public international law?	16
3. The very essence of the right	17
4. Conclusion	19
Part II: International Immunities	21
I. State immunity	21
1. State immunity in public international law	21
a) Absolute and restrictive immunity	22
b) State immunity in international and national law	23

(1) International Legislation	23
(a) The European Convention on State Immunity	23
(b) The United Nations Convention on Jurisdictional Immunities of States and Their Property	24
(2) National Legislation	25
c) Waiver of State immunity	25
d) Immunity from attachment and execution	26
2. State immunity and the jurisdiction of the forum State (Article 1 of the Convention)	26
3. State immunity in the recent Convention case-law	31
4. Alternative approaches to the conflict between State immunity and Article 6 (1) of the Convention	34
a) The equality of arms-argument and the role of alternative remedies	35
b) The comments of Judge Ress in his concurring opinion in the case of “ <i>Bosphorus Airways</i> ” v. <i>Ireland</i>	36
c) Judge Loucaides’ approach: every blanket immunity is a disproportionate restriction on Article 6 (1) of the Convention	38
(1) Discussion of the approach	38
(2) Conclusion.....	41
5. State immunity in employment-related proceedings and Article 6 (1) of the Convention	41
a) The case of <i>Fogarty v. the United Kingdom</i>	41
(1) International practice regarding State immunity in employment disputes	42
(2) The decision of the Court	43
(3) Discussion of the judgment	44
(4) Conclusion	46
(5) The dissenting opinion by Judge Loucaides	47
b) Discriminatory immunity rules in employment-related disputes	48
c) The case of <i>Cudak v. Lithuania</i>	50
6. The “personal injury exception” and Article 6 (1) of the Convention: the case of <i>McElhinney v. Ireland</i>	53
a) Domestic legislation and State practice regarding the personal injury exception	54
b) International instruments and the personal injury exception	57
c) The restrictive interpretation of the personal injury exception (“insurable” personal injury)	59
d) Acts of the armed forces of the foreign State and the personal injury exception	59

e) Discussion of the judgment	60
f) Conclusion	63
7. State immunity for serious human rights violations and its compatibility with Article 6 (1) of the Convention	64
a) Practice outside of Europe	65
b) Conclusion	68
c) The case of <i>Al-Adsani v. the United Kingdom</i>	68
(1) The decision of the majority	70
(2) The reasoning of the minority	72
(3) <i>Jus cogens v. State immunity</i>	72
d) Does the UN Torture Convention restrict State immunity in civil proceedings?	77
(1) A historic and systematic interpretation of Article 14 of the United Nations Torture Convention	78
(2) Conclusion	80
e) Developments since the <i>Al-Adsani</i> judgment	81
(1) Developments at the international level	81
(2) Developments at the domestic level	82
(3) The case of <i>Germany v. Italy</i> before the International Court of Justice	84
f) Conclusion	85
8. The responsibility under the Convention of the foreign State which successfully invokes immunity in the proceedings before the courts of the forum State	86
II. Immunity from execution and the right to enforce a judgment under Article 6 (1) of the Convention	88
1. The right to execute a judgment	88
2. Immunity from execution	89
3. Case-law of the Court	92
a) The case of <i>Kalageropoulou and Others v. Greece and Germany</i>	92
(1) Background to the case	92
(2) The enforcement proceedings in Greece	95
(3) The decision of the Court	96
(a) The complaint against Germany	96
(b) The complaint against Greece	96
(4) Further developments on the matter	99
b) The case of <i>Treska v. Albania and Italy</i>	100
c) The case of <i>Manoilescu and Dobrescu v. Romania and Russia</i>	102

d) The case-law of the Commission: the case of <i>N, C, F and AG v. Italy</i>	103
e) Immunity from execution and State agencies: the case of <i>Hirschhorn v. Romania</i>	103
f) Conclusion	105
4. <i>Jus cogens</i> and the right to enforcement of a judgment	105
III. Immunities of Heads of State, foreign ministers, diplomats and other State officials	107
1. Immunity of incumbent Heads of States	107
a) The legal position under public international law	107
(1) International instruments	109
(2) Exemptions in the statutes of international criminal tribunals	109
b) The case of <i>Association SOS Attentats and Beatrix de Boery v. France</i>	110
(1) The decision of the Court	111
(2) The conflict between immunity of incumbent Heads of State and Article 6 (1) of the Convention in the present case	111
(3) Conclusion	114
2. Immunity of former Heads of States	114
a) The legal position under public international law	114
b) Conflict with Article 6 (1) of the Convention	114
c) Case-law of the Court	115
3. Immunity of diplomats and foreign ministers	119
a) Diplomatic and consular immunities	119
(1) Diplomatic immunities	119
(2) Consular immunities	120
b) Case-law of the Convention organs	120
c) Immunity of foreign ministers	123
4. Immunity of other State officials	124
a) The legal position under public international law	124
b) Case-law of the Court: the <i>Jones and Others</i> case	125
(1) The decision of the Court of Appeal	127
(2) Criticism of the judgment	129
(3) The decision of the House of Lords	130
(4) The case before the European Court of Human Rights, Conclusion	131

IV. Immunity of International Organisations	132
1. Reasons for the immunity of international organisations	133
2. The scope of the immunity of international organisations	134
3. The conflict between immunity of international organisations and Article 6 (1) of the Convention	136
4. The case-law of the Convention organs	138
a) Case-law of the Commission: the case of <i>Spaans v. Netherlands</i>	138
b) The cases of <i>Waite and Kennedy v. Germany</i> and <i>Beer and Regan v. Germany</i>	140
(1) The decisions of the Court	140
(2) Discussion of the judgments	141
c) The case of <i>Beer and Regan v. Germany (II)</i>	144
5. Liability for acts of international organisations	144
6. Requirements for alternative means in order to satisfy the “proportionality” criterion	148
7. The “proportionality” criterion in cases against international organisations which are not employment-related: the case of the <i>Association of Citizens “Mothers of Srebrenica” and Others v. the Netherlands and the United Nations</i>	149
8. Conclusion	153
V. Other restrictions on the right of access to court for reasons based in public international law	154
1. The case of <i>Prince Hans-Adam II of Liechtenstein v. Germany</i>	154
2. The case of <i>Markovic and Others v. Italy</i>	156
Part III: Domestic Immunities	159
I. The liability of public authorities under English Law	159
1. The former approach by the Commission	160
2. The initial approach taken by the Court	161
a) The case of <i>Ashingdane v. the United Kingdom</i>	162
b) The case of <i>Fayed v. the United Kingdom</i>	162
3. Immunity of the police: the case of <i>Osman v. the United Kingdom</i>	164
a) The judgment of the Court	165
b) Responses to the judgment	166
c) How the Court was alleged to have misinterpreted English tort law	167

4. Immunity of the social services: the case of <i>Z and Others v. the United Kingdom</i>	168
5. The question of compensation	171
6. Crown immunity: the case of <i>Roche v. the United Kingdom</i>	173
a) The decision of the majority	174
b) The opinion of the eight dissenting judges	176
7. Various approaches to a resolution of the conflict between “immunity from suit” and “immunity from liability”	177
a) The “Gearty thesis”	177
b) A “common sense application” of Article 6 (1)	178
c) The “dual limb”-approach	179
d) Proposal for a solution: the establishment of a “but for” test as first proposed by Françoise Hampson	180
(1) The dissenting opinion of Judge Zupancic in <i>Roche v. the United Kingdom</i>	181
(2) The “but for” test	181
(3) Conclusion	182
8. Judicial immunity in English tort law and in other legal systems	184
II. Parliamentary immunity	186
1. The case-law of the Commission	187
2. The case-law of the Court	188
a) The content of the remarks by a Member of Parliament	189
(1) The case of <i>A v. the United Kingdom</i>	189
(2) Discussion of the judgment	190
(3) Conclusion	191
(4) The case of <i>Zollmann v. the United Kingdom</i>	192
b) The occasion on which the statements have been made: the “Italian cases”	192
c) The refusal of the request by a Member of Parliament to have his parliamentary immunity lifted: the case of <i>Kart v. Turkey</i>	195
3. Conclusion	198
Summary	199
Bibliography	207
Index	219