

THE EUROPEAN CONVENTION ON HUMAN RIGHTS AND THE EMPLOYMENT RELATION

The accession by the European Union to the European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR) has opened up new possibilities in terms of the constitutional recognition of fundamental rights in the EU. In the field of employment law it heralds a new procedure for workers and trade unions to challenge EU law against the background of the ECHR. In theoretical terms this means that EU law now goes beyond recognition of fundamental rights as mere general principles of EU law, making the ECHR the 'gold standard' for fundamental (social) rights.

This publication of the Transnational Trade Union Rights Working Group focuses on the EU and the interplay between the Strasbourg case law and the case law of the Court of Justice of the European Union (CJEU), analysing the relevance of the ECHR for the protection of workers' rights and for the effective enjoyment of civil and political rights in the employment relation. Each chapter is written by a prominent European human rights expert and analyses the case law of the European Court of Human Rights (ECtHR), and also looks at the equivalent international labour standards within the Council of Europe (in particular the (Revised) European Social Charter), the International Labour Organization (ILO) (in particular the fundamental rights conventions) and the UN Covenants (in particular the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights) and the interpretation of these instruments by competent organs.

The authors also analyse the ways in which the CJEU has acknowledged the respective ECHR articles as 'general principles' of EU law and asks whether the Lisbon Treaty will also warrant a reassessment of the way it has treated conflicts between these 'general principles' and the so-called 'fundamental freedoms'.

The European Convention on Human Rights and the Employment Relation

Edited by
Filip Dorssemont
Klaus Lörcher
and
Isabelle Schömann

etui.



• H A R T •
PUBLISHING

OXFORD AND PORTLAND, OREGON
2013

Published in the United Kingdom by Hart Publishing Ltd
16C Worcester Place, Oxford, OX1 2JW
Telephone: +44 (0)1865 517530
Fax: +44 (0)1865 510710
E-mail: mail@hartpub.co.uk
Website: <http://www.hartpub.co.uk>

Published in North America (US and Canada)
by Hart Publishing
c/o International Specialized Book Services
920 NE 58th Avenue, Suite 300
Portland, OR 97213-3786
USA
Tel: +1 503 287 3093 or toll-free: (1) 800 944 6190
Fax: +1 503 280 8832
E-mail: orders@isbs.com
Website: <http://www.isbs.com>

© The editors and contributors severally 2013

The editors and contributors have asserted their right under the Copyright,
Designs and Patents Act 1988, to be identified as the authors of this work.

Hart Publishing is an imprint of Bloomsbury Publishing plc

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, without the prior permission of Hart Publishing, or as expressly permitted by law or under the terms agreed with the appropriate reprographic rights organisation. Enquiries concerning reproduction which may not be covered by the above should be addressed to Hart Publishing Ltd at the address above.

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data
Data Available

ISBN: 978-1-84946-338-6

Typeset by Compuscript Ltd, Shannon
Printed and bound in Great Britain by
TJ International Ltd, Padstow

Preface

‘All human rights are universal, indivisible and interdependent and interrelated.’ This Credo of the Council of Europe, reaffirmed by the Committee of Ministers on the occasion of the 50th Anniversary of the European Social Charter on 12 October 2011, may be considered as the ‘leitmotif’ of this publication. In particular, the indivisible nature of civil and political rights on the one side and social and cultural rights on the other side can best be expressed by exploring the ‘social dimension’ of the European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR). Their interdependent and interrelated character can best be demonstrated by the jurisprudence of the European Court of Human Rights (ECtHR), taking into account international and European human rights standards when interpreting the Convention, especially in the social field.

Against this background, ‘The European Convention on Human Rights and the Employment Relationship’ is the result of a research project directed by the Transnational Trade Union Rights Experts Network (TTUR). Filip Dorssemont, Klaus Lörcher and Isabelle Schömann have coordinated the efforts of the members of the network and the external experts involved. The TTUR network is an independent expert network providing valuable advice to the European Trade Union Institute (ETUI). Founded in 1999 by the late Brian Bercusson, it brings together leading labour law professors from eight Member States with an active interest in the development of EU labour law and ETUI researchers.

At present, the composition of this group is as follows: Niklas Bruun (Stockholm and Helsinki Universities), Klaus Lörcher (former legal secretary at the European Union Civil Service Tribunal), Thomas Blanke (Oldenburg University), Simon Deakin (Cambridge University), Filip Dorssemont (Université Catholique de Louvain), Antoine Jacobs (Tilburg University), Csilla Kollonay-Lehoczky (Central European University, Eötvös Loránd University, Budapest, Hungary), Mélanie Schmitt (University of Strasbourg), Bruno Veneziani (University of Bari) and Isabelle Schömann (ETUI).

On the occasion of this publication, other recognised ECHR specialists have also been invited to contribute. The publication is thus the result of the joint efforts of distinguished and upcoming experts in the fields of labour law and human rights working in a variety of EU Member States.

This book was preceded by two other scientific projects of the TTUR network which gave rise to the following two publications:

B Bercusson, *European Labour Law and the EU Charter of Fundamental Rights* (Baden-Baden, Nomos, 2006).

N Bruun, K Lörcher and I Schömann, *The Lisbon Treaty and Social Europe* (Oxford, Hart Publishing, 2012).

The conceptual approach of these two books, the first two volumes of a trilogy, bears witness to the TTUR’s attachment to fundamental rights as a lever for social

justice and progress. The present volume, the last of the trilogy, maps the progressive development of human rights within the EU legal order and the increasing relevance of human rights in achieving a more social Europe.

The basic idea behind the book is to highlight the potential of the ECHR when interpreted using the methodology developed in the *Demir and Baykara* unanimous judgment of the Grand Chamber of the ECtHR of late 2008. Alongside looking closely at this approach, the authors were asked not just to analyse ECtHR case law, but also to take account of the equivalent international labour standards within the Council of Europe (in particular the (Revised) European Social Charter), the International Labour Organization (ILO) (in particular the fundamental rights conventions) and the United Nations (UN) (in particular the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights), reviewing how these instruments are interpreted by the competent organs and comparing this with relevant ECtHR case law.

Article 6 of the Treaty on European Union (TEU),¹ as amended by the Lisbon Treaty, articulates the EU's more elaborated human rights architecture. This provision can be unfolded as a triptych. Historically, human rights protection was developed through the case law of the Court of Justice of the European Union (CJEU) referring to the ECHR as a source of the 'general principles' of EU law (*cf* Article 6, § 3 TEU). The classical reference to fundamental rights as mere 'general principles' raises the question whether a reassessment is needed of the way in which the CJEU has treated conflicts between these 'general principles' and the so-called 'fundamental (economic) freedoms'. This provision recognises human rights as a source of *fundamental* principles.

As the second panel of the unfolding triptych, this book gains further momentum from the EU's constitutional obligation (Article 6, § 2 TEU) to accede to the ECHR. But finally and most importantly—and completing the 'triptych'—the TEU sets a minimum level of protection of fundamental rights in recognising that the EU Charter of Fundamental Rights has the same legal value as the Treaties (Article 6 § 1 TEU). This is particularly important with regard to the fundamental social rights enshrined under the 'Solidarity' Title of the Charter. Indeed, the final horizontal provisions of the Charter contain these safeguards by referring twice to the ECHR (*cf* Articles 52(3) and 53 of the Charter).

¹ Article 6 TEU:

1. The Union recognises the rights, freedoms and principles set out in the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union of 7 December 2000, as adapted at Strasbourg, on 12 December 2007, which shall have the same legal value as the Treaties.
The provisions of the Charter shall not extend in any way the competences of the Union as defined in the Treaties.
The rights, freedoms and principles in the Charter shall be interpreted in accordance with the general provisions in Title VII of the Charter governing its interpretation and application and with due regard to the explanations referred to in the Charter, that set out the sources of those provisions.
2. The Union shall accede to the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms. Such accession shall not affect the Union's competences as defined in the Treaties.
3. Fundamental rights, as guaranteed by the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms and as they result from the constitutional traditions common to the Member States, shall constitute general principles of the Union's law.

The book is the result of two seminars held in Brussels in the winters of 2010 and 2011, where the project itself and its draft chapters were discussed in the presence of external discussants. Both seminars were organised by the *Atelier de Droit social* of the Université Catholique de Louvain on the premises of the Fondation Universitaire of Belgium. They were hosted by Filip Dorssemont with the indispensable assistance of two junior researchers, Auriane Lamine and Marco Rocca. The TTUR network is indebted to the new President of the ECtHR, Judge D Spielmann, for his presence and valuable guidance in the 2010 seminar. The final chapters were submitted in the summer and autumn of 2012. The conclusions were written in the winter of 2012.

The book provides a balanced equilibrium of general chapters elucidating the conceptual background of the research project and chapters providing an in-depth analysis of the *acquis* of Strasbourg case law and the potential of the most relevant provisions of the ECHR with a social dimension. No formal grid was imposed on the authors writing the commentaries, though a common methodology has been respected. The book also contains provisional conclusions relating to the ECHR's impact on individual and collective employment relations. Also elucidating the book's concept, these conclusions can thus be read as an introductory chapter.

The book shows in several ways how the ECHR continues to be a 'living instrument', to be 'interpreted and applied in a manner which renders the guarantees practical and effective and not theoretical and illusory' (to use the ECtHR's standard formulation).

The ETUI would like to thank the authors for their in-depth analysis, which shows how a comprehensive interpretation of fundamental social rights, based on ECtHR case law and underlined by both international standards and the role of the CJEU in upholding the rights enshrined in the ECHR, can contribute to the achievement of a better and more social Europe.

Maria Jepsen
ETUI
Director of the Research Department

Contents

<i>Preface</i>	v
<i>List of Contributors</i>	xi
<i>Table of Cases</i>	xiii
<i>Table of Legislation</i>	xxxi

General Part

1. The New Social Dimension in the Jurisprudence of the European Court of Human Rights (ECtHR): The <i>Demir and Baykara</i> Judgment, its Methodology and Follow-up	3
<i>Klaus Lörcher</i>	
2. A Twenty-First-Century Procession of Echternach: The Accession of the EU to the European Convention on Human Rights	47
<i>Rick Lawson</i>	
3. Procedure in the European Court of Human Rights (with a Particular Focus on Cases Concerning Trade Union Rights)	61
<i>John Hendy QC</i>	
4. The Future of the European Court of Human Rights in the Light of the Brighton Declaration	93
<i>Klaus Lörcher</i>	
5. Human Rights in Employment Relationships: Contracts as Power	105
<i>Olivier De Schutter</i>	

Analysis of the ECHR

6. The Prohibition of Slavery, Servitude and Forced and Compulsory Labour under Article 4 ECHR	143
<i>Virginia Mantouvalou</i>	
7. Labour Law Litigation and Fair Trial under Article 6 ECHR	159
<i>Sébastien Van Drooghenbroek</i>	
8. Article 8 ECHR: Judicial Patterns of Employment Privacy Protection	183
<i>Frank Hendrickx and Aline Van Bever</i>	

9. Freedom of Religion and Belief, Article 9 ECHR and the EU Equality Directive.....	209
<i>Lucy Vickers</i>	
10. The Right to Freedom of Expression in the Workplace under Article 10 ECHR.....	237
<i>Dirk Voorhoof and Patrick Humblet</i>	
11. The Right to Form and Join Trade Unions Protected by Article 11 ECHR.....	287
<i>Isabelle Van Hiel</i>	
12. Article 11 ECHR: The Right to Bargain Collectively under Article 11 ECHR.....	309
<i>Antoine Jacobs</i>	
13. The Right to Take Collective Action under Article 11 ECHR.....	333
<i>Filip Dorssemont</i>	
14. Prohibition of Discrimination under Article 14 European Convention on Human Rights	367
<i>Niklas Bruun</i>	
15. Every Natural or Legal Person is Entitled to the Peaceful Enjoyment of His or Her Possessions: Article 1, Protocol 1 to the European Convention on Human Rights	381
<i>Petra Herzfeld Olsson</i>	

Conclusions

16. The European Convention on Human Rights and the Employment Relation.....	417
<i>Filip Dorssemont and Klaus Lörcher</i>	
<i>Index</i>	431

List of Contributors

Niklas Bruun is Professor of Law at Hanken School of Economic in Helsinki. He is also the director of the research program Regulating Markets and Labour (ReMarkLab), Stockholm University, and a member of the Centre of Excellence in the Foundations of European Law and Polity, University of Helsinki.

Olivier De Schutter is Professor of Human Rights Law at the Université catholique de Louvain and at the College of Europe (Natolin). An expert on economic and social rights and economic globalisation, he has since 2008 been the United Nations Special Rapporteur on the right to food.

Filip Dorsssement is Professor of Labour Law at the Centre interdisciplinaire Droit, entreprise et société of the Université catholique de Louvain. He teaches as a guest lecturer at the Université Saint-Louis de Bruxelles. He is a member of the ReMarkLab Group.

Frank Hendrickx is Professor of Law at the University of Leuven, the Director of the Institute for Labour Law, and a part-time Chairholder in European labour law at Tilburg University. His research interests include labour and employment law, EU labour law, and sports law. He is the editor in chief of the European Labour Law Journal, and the author of numerous articles and books on Belgian, European, and comparative labour law.

John Hendy QC is a barrister in London specialising in trade union law. He is a visiting professor in the School of Law, Kings College, London; visiting professor in the Faculty of Law, University College, London; President of the International Centre for Trade Union Rights; and Chair of the Institute of Employment Rights.

Patrick Humblet is Professor of Labour Law at the Law Faculty of Ghent University. He teaches as visiting professor at Antwerp Management School and at the Royal Military Academy.

Rick Lawson is Dean of the Law School of Leiden University, the Netherlands, and Professor of European Human Rights Law. His key areas of interest are the case-law and the institutional set-up of the European Court of Human Rights, and the protection of human rights in the EU legal order.

Klaus Lörcher is former Legal Adviser to the European Trade Union Confederation (ETUC) and former Legal Secretary of the Civil Service Tribunal of the European Union.

Virginia Mantouvalou is Reader in Human Rights and Labour Law at University College London (UCL), and Co-Director of the UCL Institute for Human Rights.

Petra Herzfeld Olsson is Associate Professor in Private Law and Senior Lecturer in International Labour Law at the Law Faculty, Uppsala University. She is also member of the ReMarkLab Group.

Aline Van Bever is a research and teaching assistant at the Institute for Labour Law of the University of Leuven. She is writing a PhD concerning the potential role of so-called ‘open textured norms’, such as good faith, in employment law.

Sébastien Van Drooghenbroeck is Professor of Constitutional Law and Human Rights Law at the Université Saint-Louis de Bruxelles. He is Dean of the Law Faculty and Assessor at the Belgian Council of State.

Isabelle Van Hiel is assistant in the Department of Social Law of the University of Ghent and is currently working on her PhD on freedom of association.

Lucy Vickers is Professor of Law at the School of Law, Oxford Brookes University.

Dirk Voorhoof is Professor of Media Law, Copyright Law and Journalistic Ethics at Ghent University. He teaches European Media Law as a guest lecturer at Copenhagen University. He is a member of the Human Rights Centre and the Centre for Journalism Studies (UGent), focusing on freedom of expression and information, media regulation, human rights and democracy.

Table of Cases

European Court/Commission of Human Rights

A v UK, App No 35373/97	18, 168
AB Kurt Kellermann v Sweden, App No 41579/98	178–9, 297, 342, 349, 352, 422
Abenavoli v Italy, App No 25587/94, 2 September 1997, Reports 1997-V	161
Adami v Malta, App No 17209/02, 20 June 2006	152
Ademylmaz and others v Turkey, App No 4146/09	363
Agee v UK (1976) 7 DR 164	70
Aguilera Jiménez and others v Spain., App Nos 28389/06, 28955/06, 28957/06, 28959/06, 28961/06, 28964/06, 8 December 2009	278–9, 361–3, 425
Ahmad v UK (1981) 4 EHRR 126	211
Ahmed v UK (2000) 29 EHRR 1	64
Airey v Ireland, 9 October 1979, Series A, No 32, 2 EHRR 305	108, 382, 386, 417
Aizpurua Ortiz and others v Spain, App No 42430/05, 2 February 2010	28, 41, 389–91, 393–4, 398–9, 406–7, 411
Aka v Turkey, App No 45050/98	363
Akdivar v Turkey (1997) 23 EHRR 143	70
Aksoy v Turkey (1996) 23 EHRR 553	70
Albayrak v Turkey, App No 38406/97, 31 January 2008	256
Aldemir and others v Turkey, App Nos 32124/02, 32126/02, 32129/02, 32132/02, 32133/02 32137/02 and 32138/02, 2 June 2008	68, 71
Alekseyev v Russia, App Nos 4916/07; 25924/08; 14599/09, 21 October 2010	72
Almeida Garrett v Portugal, App Nos 29813/96 and 30229/96, 11 Jan 2000	84
Amann v Switzerland, ECHR 2000-II [2000] ECHR 87	194
Ambruosi v Italy, App No 31227/96, 19 October 2000	391
Andrejeva v Latvia, App No 55707/00, 18 February 2009	12, 42
Andrle v Czech Republic, App No 6268/08, 17 February 2011	43
Anheuser-Busch Inc v Portugal, App No 73049/01, (GC) Judgment of 11 January 2007	395, 397, 411
Apay v Turkey, App No 3964/05, 11 December 2007	163
Apostolakis v Greece, App No 39574/07, 22 October 2009	398
Appleby and others v UK, App No 44306/98, 6 May 2003	241
Armonienė v Lithuania (2009) 48 EHRR 53	70
Arrowsmith v UK [1978] 3 EHRR 218	212
Ashughyan v Armenia, App No 33268/0, 17 July 2008	239
Ásmundsson v Iceland, App No 60669/00, 12 October 2004	390, 398–400
Associated Society of Locomotive Engineers and Firemen (ASLEF) v UK, App No 1002/05, 27 February 2007, (2007) 45 EHRR 33, [2007] IRLR 361	63, 65–6, 74, 76, 126–7, 288, 302–4
Association of General Practitioners v Denmark, App No 12947/87, Decision of 12 July 1989	399, 402–3, 406
Austin and others v UK, App Nos 39692/09, 40713/09 and 41008/09, 15 March 2012	239

Autronic AG v Switzerland (1990) ECHRR (Series A) 178	81
Axel Springer AG v Germany, App No 39954/08, 7 February 2012.....	241
Aydin and others v Turkey, App No 43672/98, 20 September 2005.....	363
B v UK (1993) 15 EHRR CD 100	70
Bączkowski and others v Poland, App No 1543/06, 24 September 2007.....	63, 68, 71, 79, 224
Bahceyaka v Turkey, App No 74463/01, 13 July 2006	400
Balenović v Croatia, App No 28369/07, 30 September 2010	36
Balenović v Belgium (2007) 44 EHRR SE 5	72
Barraco v France, App No 31684/05, 5 March 2009	39, 80, 343
Barthold v Germany (1985) ECHRR (Series A) 90.....	81
Bathellier v France, App No 49001/07, decision of 12 October 2010	263, 274
Bayatyan v Armenia, App No 23459/03, 7 July 2011	23
Beer and Regan v Germany, App No 28934/95, 18 February 1999, Reports 1999-I	166
Belilos v Switzerland of 29 April 1988, Series A, No 132.....	26, 167
Benkessiouer v France, App No 26106/95, 24 August 1998.....	161
Betalaan and Huiges v The Netherlands, App No 19438/83, 3 October 1984.....	388, 396–7
Blokker BV v X, LJN BV 9483, Arnhem Court, 19 March 2012	245
Bogatu v Moldova, App No 36748/05, 27 April 2010	38
Boldea v Romania, App No 19997/02, 15 February 2007	261, 268, 273
Bönisch v Austria of 6 May 1985, Series A No 92	26
Borgers v Belgium, 30 October 1991, Series A No 214-B.....	26
Bowman v UK (1998) 26 EHRR 1	63
Bramelid and Malmström v Sweden, App Nos 8588/79 and 9589/79, Decision of 12 October 1982.....	393
Brandstetter v Austria of 28 August 1991, Series A No 211.....	26
Bronowski v Poland, App No 31443/96, 22 June 2004.....	388, 393
Brüggeman and Scheuten v Germany (1981) 3 EHRR 244	185, 187–8
Bukta and others v Hungary, App No 25691/04, ECHR 2007-IX, 17 October 2007.....	80
Bulga and others v Turkey, App No 42947/98, 20 September 2005	363
Campbell and Cosans v UK (1982) 4 EHRR 293.....	63
Campbell and Fell v UK, 28 June 1984, Series A, No 80	26, 160
Carson and others v UK, App No 42184/05, 16 March 2010.....	42, 371, 407
Casado Coca v Spain, App No 15450/89), 19 February 1993, Series A, No 285-A.....	128
Casotti et al v Italy, App No 24877/94, 16 October 199	396–7
Centro Europa 7 Srl and Di Stefano v Italy, App No 38433/09, 7 June 2012.....	241
Cereceda Martin et al v Spain (1992) 73 DR 120.....	67
Çerikçi v Turkey, App 33322/07, 13 October 2010.....	40, 64, 71, 74, 80, 84
Chassagnou v France, App Nos 25088/94, 28331/95 and 28443/95, 29 April 1999, ECHR 1999-III.....	288, 348
Cheall v UK, App No 10550/83, 13 May 1985.....	74, 300, 303
Christians against Racism and Fascism v UK (1980) 21 DR 138.....	63, 72, 80, 229
Cingil v Turkey, App No 29672/02, 21 May 2011	31, 41
Ciocan and Others v Romania, App No 6580/03, 9 December 2008	307
Cisse v France, 9 April 2002	80
Civil Partnership Act 2004	226

Clift v UK, App No 7205/07, 13 July 2010.....	370
CN and V v France, App No 67724/09, 11 October 2012	420
Connolly v Germany, Austria, Belgium, Denmark, Finland, France, Greece, Ireland, Italy, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Portugal, the United Kingdom and Sweden, App No 73274/01, 9 December 2008	238
Conroy v UK, App No 10061/82, 15 May 1986	293
Copland v UK [2007] ECHR 253	193–4, 198, 201, 206
Costa v ENEL, Case 6/64 [1964] ECR 585	412
Couez v France, App No 24271/94, 24 August 1998.....	161
Council of Civil Service Unions v UK (1987) 50 DR 228	65
Cudak v Lithuania, App No 15869/02, 23 March 2010	12, 30, 169, 171, 173–4
Cyprus v Turkey, App No 25781/94, 10 May 2001	376
D v Ireland (2006) 43 EHRR SE16	70
Dahlab v Switzerland, App No 42393/98, February 2001.....	213–14, 232, 251
Danilenkov and others v Russia, App No 67336/01, 30 July 2009.....	8, 27, 39, 71, 74, 288, 306, 361–2, 372, 375, 426
Davitashvili v Georgia, App No 22433/05, 12 May 2009	38
De Cubber v Belgium, 26 October 1984, Series A, No 86.....	26
De Diego Nafria v Spain, App No 46833/99, 14 March 2002.....	134, 241, 253, 262–3, 269, 280
De Santa v Italy, App No 25574/94, 2 September 1997	161
De Wilde, Ooms and Versyp v Belgium, App Nos 2832/66, 2835/66, 2899/66, 18 June 1971.....	153
Delgado v France, App No 38437/97, 14 November 2000	181
Demicoli v Malta, 27 August 1991, Series A, No 210	26
Demir and Baykara v Turkey [2008] ECHR 1345.....	3–13, 15–35, 37–46, 63, 72–9, 81–3, 108, 113–14, 155–6, 174, 184, 204–5, 208, 310–15, 318, 325, 329, 331, 335–6, 339, 351, 354, 357, 359–60, 364–5, 372–6, 391, 402, 406–7, 409, 418, 426, 428
Denimark Ltd v UK, App No 37660/97, 26 December 2000	388
Devlin v UK, 11 April 2002	70
Deweer v Belgium, 27 February 1980, Series A, No 35	133–5
DH and others v Czech Republic, App No 57325/00, 13 November 2007	133–6
Dilek et al v Turkey, App Nos 74611/02, 26876/02 and 27628/02, 30 January 2008	74, 336, 338–40, 344, 351–2
Djavit An v Turkey, App No 20652/92, (2005) 40 EHRR 45.....	63
Doolan, Farrugia, Jenkins, Jones, Parry, Parry, Pine, Webber v UK, App No 30678/96, (2002) 35 EHRR 20.....	63–6, 68, 73–4, 76, 85, 90, 155, 335–6, 345, 426–7
Dritsas and others v Italy, App No 2344/02, 1 February 2011	37
Dudgeon v UK (1982) 4 EHRR 149.....	84, 195, 197
Eaton and others v UK, App Nos 8476/79–8481/79, 10 December 1984.....	293
EB v France (2008) 47 EHRR 21	196
Education Co v Fitzpatrick [1961] IR 294	83
Eğitim Ve Bilim Emekçileri Sendikası v Turkey, App No 20641/05, 25 September 2012.....	427
Eldridge v British Columbia (1997) 3 SCR 624.....	122

Electrolux etc v Australian Workers Union (2004) 221 CLR 309.....	77
Enerji Yapi-yol Sen v Turkey, App No 68959/01, 21 April 2009	4, 24, 39–40, 63, 71, 74, 313, 335–6, 338–9, 346, 351, 364, 406
Englund v Sweden, App No 15533/89, 8 April 1994	298
Erciyas v Turkey, App No 10971/05, 27 September 2011	31
Erdel v Germany, App No 30067/04, 13 February 2007.....	240, 254
Eremia v The Republic of Moldova, App No 3564/11, 28 May 2013.....	373
Erkan v Turkey, App No 29840/03, 24 March 2005	400
Eskelinen v Finland, App No 63235/00, 19 April 2007	160, 162–3, 174, 388, 397–8, 402, 411
EUROFEDOP v Italy, App No 4/1999, ECSR.....	315
EUROFEDOP v Portugal, App No 5/1999, ECSR	315
European Council of Police Trade Unions v Portugal, App No 11/2001, 21 May 2002	315
Evaldsson and Others v Sweden, App No 75252/01, 13 February 2007	299, 390, 392–4, 398, 400–1, 404, 406
Evans v UK (2006) 43 EHRR 210.....	195
Eweida, Chaplin, Ladele and McFarlane v UK, App Nos 48420/10, 59842/10, 51671/10 and 36516/10, 15 January 2013.....	123, 132–3, 211–14, 224–5, 234, 424
Eweida v British Airways plc (2010) EWCA Civ 80.....	123, 224
Ezelin v France (1992) 14 EHRR 362	72, 81, 277–8
Fawsie v Greece, App No 40080/07, 28 October 2010	34–5
Fédération Hellénique des Syndicats des Employés du Secteur Bancaire (OTOE) v la Grèce, App No 72808/10, 6 December 2011	66–7
Federation of Offshore Workers' Trade Unions and Others v Norway, App No 38190/97, 27 June 2002.....	65, 74, 83, 357, 359–60, 364
Fernández Martinez v Spain, App No 56030/07, 15 May 2012.....	230–1, 239, 250–1, 253
Ferreira Alves v Portugal (No 4), App No 41870/05, 14 April 2009	25
Ferreira Alves v Portugal (No 5), App No 30381/06, 14 April 2009	25
Filippini v San Marino, App No 10526/02, 26 August 2003.....	257
Financial Times Ltd and others v UK, App No 821/03, 15 December 2009	241, 275
Fogarty v UK, App No 37112/97, 21 November 2001.....	169–72
Frankovicz v Poland, App No 53025/99, 16 December 2008.....	272–3
Friedl v Austria, 30 November 1992	80
Frydlender v France, App No 30979/96, 27 June 2000.....	181
Fuentes Bobo v Spain, App No 39293/98, 29 February 2000.....	128, 195, 237, 240–1, 243, 261–3, 269, 278, 280, 282, 285
G v Germany (1989) 60 DR 256.....	80
Galstyan v Armenia, App No 26986/03, 15 November 2007.....	80, 239
Garaudy v France, App No 65831/01, 24 June 2003	256
Gaygusuz v Austria, App No 17371/90, 16 September 1996	376
Genovese v Malta, App No 53124/09, 11 October 2011	15, 26
Gillberg v Sweden, App No 41723/06, 3 April 2012.....	241
Gjonbocari and others v Albania, App No 10508/02, 23 October 2007	181
Glas Nadezhda Eood & Elenkov v Bulgaria, App No 14134/02, 11 October 2007	240

Glasenapp v Germany, Series A, No 104 (1987) 9 EHRR 25	211, 251–2
Golder v UK, 21 February 1975, 1 EHRR 524	72
Gollnisch v France, App No 48135/08, 7 June 2011	255–6, 269
Gongadze v Ukraine, 8 November 2005	84
Goodwin v UK, App No 17488/90, 27 March 1996	275, 280
Gorzelik v Poland, (2004) 38 EHRR 1, (2005) 40 EHRR 633	63, 81
Grande Oriente d'Italia di Palazzo Giustiniani v Italy (No 2), App No 26740/02, 31 May 2007	257
Grande Oriente d'Italia di Palazzo Giustiniani v Italy, App No 35972/97, 21 October 1999	257
Groppera Radio AG and others v Switzerland, Series A, No 173 (1990)	240
Guadagnino v Italy and France, App No 2555/03, 18 January 2011	30, 169, 173–4
Guja v Moldova, App No 14277/04, 12 February 2008	134, 269–75, 280, 419
Gustafsson v Sweden, App No 15573/89, 25 April 1996	112, 296–8, 311, 337, 342, 349, 352, 389, 394, 405, 422
Hachette Filipacchi Associés ('Ici Paris') v France, App No 12268/03, 23 July 2009	241
Hachette Filipacchi Associés v France, App No 71111/01, 14 June 2007	240
Hachette Filipacchi Presse Automobile and Dupuy v France, App No 13353/05, 5 March 2009	241
Hadjianastassiou v Greece, App No 12945/87, 16 December 1992	242
Halford v UK (1998) 24 EHRR 523	189, 191, 193–4, 198, 201, 206
Halil Özbent v Turkey, App No 56395/08	282
Handyside v UK, Series A, No 24 (1976) 1 EHRR 737	197, 202, 213, 251
Hasan and Chaush v Bulgaria (2002) 34 EHRR 55	215, 218, 229
Hatton and others v UK, App No 3602/77, 2 April 2007	201
Hauschildt v Denmark, 24 May 1989, Series A, No 154	26
Heinisch v Germany, App No 28274/08, 21 July 2011	33, 36, 87, 238, 240–2, 246, 273–4, 281–2, 419, 422–3
Hertel v Switzerland, App No 25181/94, 25 August 1998	268
Hiipakka and others v Finland, App No 29069/95, 15 May 1996	393
Hilton v UK (1988) 57 DR 108	84
Horvath and Kiss v Hungary, App No 11146/11, 29 January 2013	378
I v Finland [2008] ECHR 20511	193
İçen v Turkey, App No 45912/06, 31 May 2011	31
Iljeva and others, App No 21080/06, 2 December 2008	38
Independent News and Media and Independent Newspapers Ireland v Ireland, App No 55120/00, 16 June 2005	240
Informationsverein Lentia and others v Austria, Series A, No 276 (1994)	240
Ireland v UK (1978) 2 EHRR 25	203
Ivanov and Dimitrov v The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, App No 46881/06, 21 October 2010	31
Ivanov v Russia, App No 35222/04, 20 February 2007	256
Iverson v Norway, App No 1468/62, 17 December 1963	152
Iwazskiewicz v Poland, App No 30614/06, 26 July 2011	43
James and others v UK, App No 8793/97, 21 February 1986	391, 393
Jehovah's Witnesses of Moscow v Russia (2011) 53 EHRR 4, App No 302/02, 10 June 2010	78, 81–2
JM v UK, App No 37060/06, 28 September 2011	34
Johansson v Sweden (1990) 65 DR 202	74, 298
Juppala v Finland, App No 18620/03, 2 December 2008	271

K, C, M v The Netherlands (1995) 80-A DR87	84
Kalaç v Turkey, App No 20704/92, App No 20704/92 1 July 1997	132, 214
Kara v UK, App No 36528/97, 22 October 1998	213
Karaçay v Turkey, App No 6615/03, 27 March 2007	39, 63–4, 71, 74, 80, 84, 343–5, 352
Karademirci and others v Turkey, App Nos 37096/97 and 37101/97, 25 January 2005	248, 282
Karaduman v Turkey, App No 16278/90	214
Karakurt v Austria, App No 32441/96, 14 September 1999	350, 422
Kaya and Seyhan v Turkey, App No 30946/04, 15 September 2009	24, 39–40, 64, 71, 74, 80, 84, 344–5, 352
Kayasu v Turkey, App Nos 64119/00 and 76292/01, 13 November 2008	271
Kenedi v Hungary, App No 31475/05, 26 May 2009	241
Kern v Germany, App No 26870/04, 29 May 2007	254–5
Kholer v Austria, App No 18991/91, 13 October 1993	177
Khursid Mustafa and Tarzibachi v Sweden, App No 23883/06, 16 December 2008	241
Kiyutin v Russia, App No 2700/10, 10 March 2011	23
Klass and others v Germany, Series A, No 28 (1979–80) 2 EHRR 214	63, 191
Klein v Austria, App No 57028/00, 3 March 2011	42, 398
KMC v Hungary, App No 19554/11, 10 July 2012	307, 377
Knotts v US 460 US 276 (1983)	187
Knudsen v Norway, App No 11045/84 (1985) 42 D&R 247	215
Kokkinakis v Greece, Series A, No 260-A [1993] 17 EHRR 397	210
Kontinen v Finland (1996) 87 D&R 68	215
Kopecký v Slovakia, App No 44912/98, 28 September 2004	387–8
Köpke v Germany, App No 420/07, 5 October 2010	33, 193
Kosiek v Germany, Series A, No 105 (1986) 9 EHRR 328	191, 211, 251–2
Kotov v Russia, App No 54522/00, 14 January 2010	390, 399, 410
Kozak v Poland, App No 13102/02, 2 March 2010	374
Kravtsov v Russia, App No 39272/04, 5 April 2011	32
Kreuz v Poland, App No 28249/95, 29 June 2001	180
Krone Verlag GmbH & CoKG (No 1) v Austria, App No 34315/96, 26 February 2002	240
Kudeshkina v Russia, App No 29492/05, 26 February 2009	37, 237, 240, 242, 258–61, 271, 280, 282
Kuznetsov v Russia, App No 10877/04, 23 January 2009	71, 80
Lahr v Germany, App No 16912/05, 1 July 2008	240, 254
Lalmahomed v The Netherlands, App No 26036/08, 22 February 2011	15
Langborger v Sweden, App No 11179/84, 22 June 1989, Series A, vol 155	26, 177, 179
Lapalorcía v Italy, App No 25586/94, 2 September 1997	161
Lautsi v Italy, App No 30814/06, 18 March 2011	213, 232
Le Calvez v France, App No 25554/94, 29 July 1998	161
Le Compte, Van Leuven and de Meyere v Belgium [1982] 4 EHRR 1	71, 347–9
Leander v Sweden, Series A, No 116 (1987) 9 EHRR 433	127, 191, 211
Leempoel and SA Ciné Revue v Belgium, App No 64772/01, 9 November 2006	240
Lelas v Croatia, App No 55555/08, 20 May 2010	41, 387, 390–1, 398, 401
Levänen v Finland, App No 34600/03, 11 April 2006	388
Liman-Is Sendikası v Turkey, App No 29608/05 etc, 12 October 2010	32
Lingens v Austria (1986) ECHRR (Series A) 103	81
Loizidou v Turkey, (1995) 20 EHRR 99	63

Lüdi v Switzerland, Series A, No 238 (1992) 15 EHRR 173	188
Luka v Romania, App No 34197/02, 21 June 2009	178–80
Lustig-Prean and Beckett v UK [1999] ECHR 71, (2001) 31 EHRR 23	194, 203
Madsen v Denmark, App No 58341/00, 7 November 2002	138, 185, 192, 201
Maestri v Italy, App No 39748/98, 17 February 2004	257
Maggio and others v Italy, App No 46286/09 etc, 31 May 2011	29, 41
Majski v Croatia (No 2), App No 16924/08, 19 July 2011	163
Malone v UK, Series A, No 82 (1984) 7 EHRR 14	127, 191, 194, 198
Mangouras v Spain, App No 12050/04, 28 September 2010	29, 87
Manole and others v Moldova, App No 13936/02, 17 September 2009	36, 38
Marchenko v Ukraine, App No 4063/04, 19 February 2009	134, 264, 270–2
Marckx v Belgium, App No 6833/74, (Pl) Judgment of 13 June 1979	8, 77, 387
Markin v Russia, App No 30078/06, 7 October 2010	35, 43, 132, 134
Markt Intern Verlag GmbH and Klaus Beermann v Germany, Series A, No 165 (1990)	240
Maruskov and others, App No 19667/06, 2 December 2008	38
MDU v Italy, App No 58540/00, 28 January 2003	257
Medvedyev and others v France, App No 3394/03, 29 March 2010	27–8
Melnychuk v Ukraine, App No 28743/03, 5 July 2005	397
Meltex Ltd and Mesrup Movsesyan v Armenia, App No 32283/04, 17 June 2008	240
Menchinskaya v Russia, App No 42454/02, 15 January 2009	9, 16, 26, 29
Metrobus v UNITE the Union [2009] IRLR 851	74
Mihal v Slovakia, App No 23360/08, 28 July 2011	152
Miroļubovs and others v Latvia, App No 798/05, 15 September 2009	12, 25–6
Mishgjoni v Albania, App No 18381/05, 7 December 2010	181
Moldovan and others v Romania, App Nos 41138/98 and 64320/01, 12 July 2005	376
Molnár v Hungary, App No 10346/05, 7 October 2008	239
Monory v Hungary and Romania, 17 February 2004	84
Montion v France (1987) 52 DR 227	70
Morissens v Belgium, App No 11389/85, 3 May 1988	265
Moskal v Poland, App No 10373/05, 15 September 2009	386, 391–2, 395, 398–9
Nachova and others v Bulgaria, App Nos 43577/98 and 43579/98, 6 July 2005	372
National and Local Government Officers Association (NALGO) v UK, App No 21386/93, 1 September 1993	300–2, 364
National Association of Teachers in Further and Higher Education v UK (1998) EHRR CD 122	65, 73, 355–6
National Union of Belgian Police v Belgium, App No 4464/70, 27 October 1975	113, 288–9, 304, 310, 318, 335, 376
Nazsiz and Nazsiz v Turkey, App No 22412/05, 26 May 2009	163
Nerva and others v UK, App No 42295/98, 24 September 2002	394, 403–4
News Verlags GmbH & CoKG v Austria, App No 31457/96, 11 January 2000	240
Nicodemo v Italy, App No 25839/94, 2 September 1997	161
Niemietz v Germany, 16 December 1992, Series A, No 251-B	71, 187, 189–90, 206, 211
Nilsen and Johnsen v Norway, App No 23118/93, 25 November 1999	239, 268, 276
Ninn-Hansen v Denmark, App No 28972/95, 18 May 1999	257

Nur Radyo Ve Televizyon Yayincılığı AS, v Turkey, App No 42284/05, 12 October 2010.....	241
Obermeier v Austria, App No 11761/85, 28 June 1990, Series A, vol 179.....	160
Oberschlick v Austria (1991) ECHRR (Series A) 204.....	81
Observer and Guardian v UK (1991) ECHRR (Series A) 216.....	81
Obst v Germany, App No 425/03, 23 September 2010	33, 124–5, 132, 195–6, 198, 230–1, 250
Okpiz v Germany, App No 59140/00, 25 October 2005	371
Ólafsson v Iceland, App No 20161/06, 27 April 2010	38, 76, 288, 298–300, 426
Olsson v Sweden (1988) 11 EHRR 259	81
ON v Bulgaria, App No 35221/97, 6 April 2000	394
Öneryildiz v Turkey, App No 48939/99, 30 November 2004.....	393
Opuz v Turkey, App No 33401/02, 9 September 2009	16, 23, 373
Österreichischer Rundfunk v Austria, App No 35841/02, 7 December 2006	240
Otto v Germany, App No 27574/02, 24 November 2005	132, 240, 253–4
Ouranio Toxo v Greece, App No 74989/01, 20 October 2005.....	68
Oya Ataman v Turkey, App No 74552/01, 5 December 2006	80
Özgür Gündem v Turkey, App No 23144/99, 16 March 2000	241
Özpinar v Turkey, App No 20999/04, 19 October 2010.....	32–3
Palmer, Wyeth, National Union of Rail, Maritime and Transport Workers v UK, App No 30671/96, (2002) 35 EHRR 20	63–6, 68, 73–4, 76, 85, 90, 155, 335–6, 345, 426–7
Partidul Comunistilor (Neperceristi) (2007) 44 EHRR 17.....	82
Pasko v Russia, App No 69519/01, 22 October 2009	242
Patera v Czech Republic, 10 January 2006.....	67
Patyi v Hungary, App No 5529/05, 7 January 2009.....	72, 81–2
Pay v UK (2009) 48 EHRR SE2, [2009] IRLR 139	196, 202–3, 239, 245–6, 253, 256
Peck v UK (2003) 36 EHRR 41.....	188, 193
Peev v Bulgaria, App No 64209/01, 26 July 2007	238, 240, 248
Pellegrin v France, App No 28541/95, 8 December 1999.....	161–2
Pereira Henriques and others v Luxembourg, App No 60255/00, 9 May 2006.....	373
Perry v UK [2003] ECHR 375, (2004) 39 EHRR 76.....	188, 193
Pešić v Serbia, App No 46749/06, 14 September 2010.....	38
Pfeifer and Plankl v Austria, 25 February 1992, Series A, No 227	133
Pfeifer v Austria (2009) 48 EHRR 8.....	71
PG and JH v UK, App No 44787/98, [2001] ECHR 546	187–8
Pichon and Sajous v France, App No 49853/99, 2 October 2001.....	212
Piersack v Belgium, 1 October 1982, Series A, No 53	26
Pinnacle Meat Processors Company and others v UK, App No 33298/96, 21 October 1998.....	396
Pitkevich v Russia, App No 47936/99, 8 February 2001.....	211, 214, 257
Plon (Société) v France, App No 58148/00, 18 May 2004	240
Ponomaryov and Ponomaryov v Bulgaria, App No 5335/05, 21 June 2011.....	21
Popov and Others v Bulgaria, App Nos 48047/99, 48961/99, 50786/99 and 50792/99, 6 November 2003.....	288
Poyraz v Turkey, App No 15966/06, 7 December 2010	264
Predota v Austria, App No 28962/95 18 January 2000.....	239, 246, 262
Pressos Compania Naviera v Belgium, App No 17849/91, 20 November 1995.....	388, 398, 407
Price v UK, App No 33394/96, 10 July 2001	377

Professional Trades Union for Prison, Correctional and Secure Psychiatric Workers and Others (POA) Bates and Watts v UK, App No 59253/11, 21 May 2013	66–7, 87
Puchstein v Austria, App No 20089/06, 28 January 2010	177
Purcell v Ireland (1991) 70 DR 262	64
Puzinas v Lithuania, App No 63767/00, 18 November 2000	401, 404
R (on the application of Amicus—MSF and others) v Secretary of State for Trade and Industry and others [2004] EWHC 860 (Admin)	228
Raichinov v Bulgaria, App No 47579/99, 20 April 2006	260–1, 269
Rantsev v Cyprus and Russia, App No 25965/04, 7 January 2010	10, 12, 25, 147–9, 154–5
Rašković and Milunović v Serbia, App No 1789/07, 31 May 2011	32, 41
Reaney v Hereford Diocesan Board of Finance Case No 1602844/2006	227–9
Redfearn v UK, App No 47335/06, 6 November 2012	304
Refah Partisi (the Welfare Party) v Turkey (GC), App Nos 41340/98, 41342/98, 41343/98 and 41344/98, ECHR 2003-II	79, 82
Reid v UK, App No 9520/81, 12 October 1983, 12 October 1983	293
Ringier Axel Springer Slovakia, AS v Slovakia, App No 41262/05, 26 July 2011	241
Rıza Erdoğan v Turkey, App No 15520/96	282
Roberts v United States Jaycees, 468 US 609, 622 (1984)	125–6
Roche v UK, App No 32555/96, 23 May 2002	84
Roffey and others v UK App No. 1278/11, 21 May 2013	85
Rommelfanger v Germany, App No 12242/86, 6 September 1989	124–5, 195, 215, 267
Rotaru v Romania, ECHR 2000-V	193
Russian Labour Confederation (KTR) v Russian Federation, Committee on Freedom of Association, Case no 2199, Report no 331	306
S v Austria, 13 December 1990	80
SA Dangeville v France, App No 36677/97, 16 April 2002	412
Sabeh El Leil v France, App No 34869/05, 29 June 2011	30, 169, 173–4
Sahin and Sahin v Turkey, App No 13279/05, 20 October 2011	31
Sahin v Turkey, App No 44774/98, 10 November 2005	213
Saidoun v Greece, App No 40083/07, 28 October 2010	34–5
Saime Özcan v Turkey, App No 22943/04, 15 September 2009	40, 64, 71, 74, 79, 343–5, 352
Salaman v UK, App No 43505/98, 15 June 2000	257
Sánchez and others v Spain, App Nos 28955/06, 28957/06, 28959/06 and 28964/06, 12 September 2011	37–8, 71, 77–8, 112, 125, 128–30, 134, 238–41, 246, 279–80, 285–6, 361, 363, 418–19, 425
Sanchez Navajas v Spain, App No 57442/00, 21 June 2001	74, 305
Saniewski v Poland, App No 40319/98, 26 June 2001	211
Šarić and others v Croatia, App Nos 38767/07, etc, 18 October 2011	41
Satılmış Akkaya and Murat Işeri, App No 29283/07	282
Savino and others v Italy, App Nos 17214/05, 42113/04 and 20329/05, 28 April 2009	163–4, 166–7
Saya and others v Turkey, App No 4327/02, 7 January 2009	68, 71
Schettini and others v Italy, App No 29529/95, 9 November 2000	113, 400, 403
Schmidt and Dahlström v Sweden (1976) 1 EHRR 632	72, 113, 304, 335–8, 345, 354
Schmidt v Austria, App No 513/05, 17 July 2008	201
Schmidt v Germany, App No 13580/88, 18 July 1994	151

Schüth v Germany, App No 1620/03, 23 September 2010	33–5, 138, 195–6, 198, 230–1, 250–2, 386, 397
Sdružení Jihočeské Matky v Tsjech Republic, App No 19101/03, 10 July 2006	241
Sedelmayer v Germany, App Nos 30190 and 30216/06, 10 November 2009	28
Sejdic and Finci v Bosnia and Herzegovina, App Nos 27996/06 and 34836/06, 22 December 2009	379
Selmouni v France (GC), App No 25803/94, ECHR 1999-V	79
Serif v Greece (2001) 31 EHRR 20	215, 218, 229
Seurot v France, App No 57383/00, 18 May 2004	243, 255
SH and others v Austria App No 57813/00, 3 November 2011	19
Şişman and others v Turkey, App No 1305/05, 27 September 2011	39
Sibson v UK (1993) ECHR Series A 258-A	74, 111, 293, 353
Sidabaras v Lithuania [2006] 42 EHRR 6	71
Sidabras and Dziautas v Lithuania, ECHR 2004-VIII (2004) 42 EHRR 104	155, 184, 190, 206, 211, 371, 386, 397, 417
Sidiropoulos v Greece, 10 July 1998, Reports 1998-IV	81
Siebenhaar v Germany, App No 18136/02, 3 February 2011	35, 125, 132, 230–2, 250
Siglfirdingur ehf v Iceland, App No 34142/96, 7 September 1999	178–9
Sigma Radio Television Ltd v Cyprus, App Nos 32181/04, 35122/05, 21 July 2011	241
Sigurjónsson v Iceland, 30 June 1993, Series A, No 264	6, 18, 74, 76, 111, 288–9, 293, 295, 299–300, 303, 347, 420
Siliadin v France, App No 73316/01, 26 July 2005 [2005] ECHR 545	9, 108, 145–51, 153–6
Sindicatul Păstorul cel Bun v Romania, App No 2330/09, decision of 31 January 2012	28, 63, 213, 346, 421
Sipoş v Romania, App No 26125/04, 3 May 2011	32
Sisman v Turkey, App No 1305/05, ECtHR 2011	361
Smeeton-Wilkinson v Sweden, App No 24601/94, 28 February 1996	178
Smith and Grady v UK [1999] ECHR 72, (2000) 29 EHRR 493, (2000) 31 EHRR 24	194, 203
Smith Kline and French Laboratories Ltd v The Netherlands, App No 12633/87, 4 October 1990	397
Smokovitis and others v Greece, App No 46356/99, 11 April 2002	398, 401–2
Société de Conception de Presse et d'Édition and Ponson v France, App No 26935/05, 5 March 2009	240
Soltysyak v Russia, App No 4663/05, 10 February 2011	23
Sommerfeld v Germany, App No 31871/96, 8 July 2003	371
Sørensen and Rasmussen v Denmark [GC], App Nos 52562/99 and 52620/99, (2006) ECHR 24	6, 18, 73, 87, 111, 295–6, 298–9, 419, 424
Sorguç v Turkey, App No 17089/03, 23 June 2009	267–8
Sosinowska v Poland, App No 14277/04, 18 October 2011	36
Sporrong and Lönnroth v Sweden, App Nos 7151/75 and 7152/75, 23 September 1982	389
Stallarholmens Platslageri o Ventilation Handelsbolag and others v Sweden, App No 12733/87, 7 September 1990	178
Stănciulescu v Romania, App No 14621/06, 22 November 2011	262, 275

Standard Verlagsgesellschaft (No 2) v Austria, App No 37464/02, 22 February 2007.....	240
Stec and others v UK, App Nos 65731/01 and 65900/01, 12 April 2006.....	371, 386, 389, 407, 411, 417
Stedman v UK (1997) 23 EHRR CD 168	211
Stefanica and others v Romania, App No 38155/02, 2 November 2010	32
Stigson v Sweden, App No 12264/86, 13 July 1988	398
Stojanovski, App No 30350/06, 2 December 2008	38
Storksén v Norway, App No 19819/92, 5 July 1994	400
Stummer v Austria, App No 37452/02, 7 July 2011.....	41, 77, 153–5, 157, 400, 404, 408–9
Suk v Ukraine, App No 10972/05, 10 March 2011.....	43
Sukut v Turkey, App No 59773/00, 11 September 2007	163
Sunday Times v UK (1977) 28 ECHR B 64.....	79, 81, 198
Swedish Engine Drivers' Union v Sweden (1979–80) 1 EHRR 617	72, 113, 288–9, 297, 304, 310
Swedish Transport Workers' Union v Sweden, App No 53507/99, 30 November 2004.....	329
Szima v Hungary, App No 29723/11, 9 October 2012.....	282–3, 285, 425
Tănase v Moldova, App No 7/08, 27 April 2010.....	17, 19, 23
Tănase v Moldova, App No 33401/02, 27 April 2010.....	75
Talmon v Netherlands, App No 30300/96, 26 February 1997	152
Tarkoev and others v Estonia, App Nos 14480/08 and 47916/08, 4 November 2010.....	42–3
Társaság a Szabadságjogokért v Hungary, App No 37374/05, 14 April 2009	241
Tatár and Fáber v Hungary, App Nos 26005/08 and 26160/08, 12 June 2012.....	239
Tek Gıda İş Sendikası v Turkey, App No 35009/05	319
Terem Ltd et al v Ukraine, App No 70297/01, 18 October 2005	70
Thaler v Austria, App No 58141/00, 3 February 2005.....	177, 179
Thlimmenos v Greece.....	211, 373
Tillack v Belgium, App No 20477/05, 27 November 2007.....	275
Titarenko v Russia, App No 25966/04, 10 March 2011	31
Trade Union of the Police in the Slovak Republic and others v Slovakia, App No 11828/08	419, 423
Trakoev and others v Estonia, App Nos 14480/08 and 47916/08, 4 November 2010.....	407
Transado-Transportes Fluviais do Sado v Portugal, App No 35943/02, 16 December 2003.....	394
Tre traktörer aktiebolag v Sweden, App No 10873/84, 7 July 1989.....	388, 396
Tripon v Romania, App No 27062/04, 6 March 2012.....	181–2
Trofimchuk v Ukraine, App No 4241/03, 28 January 2011	40, 71, 74, 344, 356–7, 359, 361, 365
Tüm Haber Sen and Çınar v Turkey, App No 28602/95, (2008) 46 EHRR 19	69, 73, 79, 81
TV Vest AS & Rogaland Pensjonistparti v Norway, App No 21132/05, 11 December 2008.....	240
Twenty-one Detained Persons v Germany, App Nos 3134/67, 3172/67, 3188–3206/67, 6 April 1968	153
Tyrer v UK, 25 April 1978, (1979–80) 2 EHRR 1.....	72
Ukrainian Media Group v Ukraine, App No 72713/01, 29 March 2005.....	240
Ulger v Turkey, App No 25321/02, 26 June 2007	180

UNISON v UK, App No 53574/99, 10 January 2002, [2002]	
IRLR 497	65, 73–4, 77, 83, 113, 336, 338, 340, 353–4, 357, 359–60, 364
Urban v Poland, App No 23614/08, 30 November 2010	179–80
Urbanek v Austria, App No 35123/05, 9 December 2010	180
Urcan v Turkey, App No 23018/04, etc, 17 October 2008	64, 71, 74, 79, 343, 345, 352
Utd Communist Party of Turkey v Turkey (1998) 26 EHRR 121 T	82
Valkov and others v Bulgaria, App No 2033/04, 25 October 2011	43–4
Vallauri v Italy, App No 39128/05, 20 October 2009	239, 251, 253, 256, 268
Van der Heijden v The Netherlands, App No 11002/84, 8 March 1985	126, 254, 304
Van der Mussele v Belgium, App No 1989/80, 23 November 1983	151–2, 155, 389
Van Droogenbroeck v Belgium, App No 7906/77, 5 July 1979	145, 153
Van Marle and others v The Netherlands, App Nos 8543/79, 8674/79, 8675/79 and 8685/97, 26 June 1986	396
Vasilchenko v Russia, App No 34784/02, 23 September 2010	31
Vejdeland and others v Sweden, App No 1813/07, 9 February 2012	251
Vellutini and Michel v France, App No 32820/09, 6 October 2011	38, 71, 77, 241–2, 246, 281–2
Verein gegen Tierfabriken VGT (No 2) v Switzerland, App No 32772/02, 4 October 2007	241
Verein gegen Tierfabriken VGT v Switzerland, App No 24699/94, 28 June 2001	241
Vereinigung Demokratischer Soldaten Österreichs and Gubi v Austria, App No 15153/89, 19 December 1994	243
Veriter v France, App No 31508/07, 14 October 2010	31
Vodă v Romania, App No 35812/02, 19 January 2010	38
Vogt v Germany, App No 17851/91, 26 September 1995	132, 134, 211, 237, 240, 252–4, 256–7
Volkov v Ukraine, App No 21722/11, 9 January 2013	33, 71, 307, 429
Voskuil v The Netherlands, App No 64752/01, 22 November 2007	275
W, X, Y and Z v UK, App Nos 3435–3438/67, 19 July 1968	152
Waite and Kennedy v Germany, App No 26083/94, 18 February 1999	166–9
Weber v Switzerland (1990) ECHRR (Series A) 177	81
Weller v Hungary, App No 44399/05, 31 March 2009	15
Werner v Poland, 15 November 2001	71
Wessels-Bergervoet v The Netherlands, App No 34462/97, 4 June 2002	376
Whiteside v UK (1994) 76-A DR 80	70
Wille v Liechtenstein, App No 28396/95, 28 October 1999	240, 242–3, 253, 258, 260–1, 263, 268, 271, 280, 282
Wilson, National Union of Journalists v UK, App No 30668/96, (2002) 35 EHRR 20	63–6, 68, 73–4, 76, 85, 90, 112–15, 135, 288, 304–5, 311, 335–6, 345, 372, 426–7
Wirtschafts-Trend Zeitschriften-Verlagsgesellschaft MBH (n° 3) v Austria, App No 66298/01 and 15653/02, 13 December 2005	240
Wojtas-Kaleta v Poland, App No 20436/02, 16 July 2009	241–3, 253, 282
Wretlund v Sweden, App No 46210/99, 9 March 2004	138, 198, 201
X and Y v The Netherlands, Series A, No 32 (1985)	200
X Union v France (1983) 32 DR 261	64
X v Belgium, App No 4072/69, 3 February 1970	290
X v Federal Republic of Germany, App No 13079/87, 6 March 1989	343

X v Germany, App No 4673/70, 1 April 1974	152
X v Germany, App No 8410/78, 13 December 1979	388
X v Italy, App No 7459/76, 7 October 1977	397
X v The Netherlands, App No 9926/82, 1 March 1983	300
X v UK, 28 November 1994	67
Yazar v Turkey App No 22723/93, etc, ECHR 2002-II	82
Young, James and Webster v UK [1981] IRLR 408	74, 81, 105–6, 128, 288–90, 294
Zarembová v Slovakia, App No 7908/07, 23 November 2010	31
Zaunegger v Germany, App No 22028/04, 3 December 2009	374
Ždanoka v Latvia, App No 58278/00, 16 March 2006	254
Zekir v the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, App No 19667/06, 2 December 2008	38
Žičkus v Lithuania, App No 26652/02, 7 April 2009	34
Zivic v Serbia, App No 37204/08, 13 September 2011	32
Zolotukhin v Russia, App No 14939/03, 10 February 2009	10
Zouboulidis v Greece (No 2), App No 36963/06, 25 June 2009	398, 401
Zylkov v Russia, App No 5613/04, 21 June 2011	30

Court of Justice of the European Union

Abrahamsson and Anderson v Fogelqvist, Case C-407/98 [2000] ECR I-5539	378
Albany International BV v Stichting Bedrijfspensioenfonds Textielindustrie, Case C-67/96, ECR I-05751	329, 421
Angonese, Case C-281/98 [2000] ECR I-4139	413
Asti v Chambre des employés privés, Case C-213/90, 4 July 1991	349
Badeck and others, Case C-158/97 [2000] ECR I-1875	377–8
Berlusconi, Joined Cases C-387/02, C-391/02 and C-403/02 [2005] ECR I-3565	13
Bilka-Kaufhaus v Weber von Hartz, Case C-170/84 [1986] ECR 1607	232–3
Booker Aquaculture Ltd v The Scottish Ministers, Cases C-20/00 and C-64/00 [2003] ECR I-7411	411
Centrum voor gelijkheid van kansen en voor racismebestrijding v Firma Feryn NV, Case C-54/07 [2008] ECR I-5187	120, 247
Chacón Navas v Eurest Colectividades SA, Case C-13/05 [2006] ECR I-6467	223
Commission v Germany, Case C-271/08, 17 July 2010	328–9
Connolly v Commission, Case T-34/96 and T-163/96 [1999] ECR II-463	266
Connolly v Commission of the European Communities, Case C-274/99 P [2001] ECR I-638	239, 242, 249, 266–7
Cwik v Commission of the European Communities, Case C-340/00 P, [2001] ECR I-10269	265
Cwik v Commission of the European Communities, Case T-82/99 [2000] ECR II-713	238, 242, 265–6
Defrenne v Société anonyme belge de navigation aérienne Sabena, Case C-43/75 [1976] ECR 00455 (Defrenne II)	367, 412–13
Dominguez v Centre Ouest Atlantique, Case C-282/10, 24 January 2012	413
Fédération nationale des syndicats d'exploitants agricoles (FNSEA) and Others v Commission of the European Communities, Joined Cases T-217/03 and T-245/03	421
Francovich, Joined Cases C-6/90 and C 9/90 [1991] ECR I-5357	412
Fuchs, Cases C-159/10 and C-160/10, 21 July 2011	328
Hauer v Land Rheinland-Pfalz, Case C-44/79 [1979] ECR 3737	411–12

Heath v BCE, Case F-121/10, Civil Service Tribunal, 29 September 2011	326–7
Hennigs, Cases C-297/10 and C-298/10, 8 September 2011	328
Impact v Minister for Agriculture and Food and others, Case C-268/06, 15 April 2008.....	413
Irish Farmers' Association and others, Case C-22/94 [1997] ECR I-1809	411
Kalanke v Freie Hansestadt Bremen, Case C-450/93 [1995] ECR I-3051	377–8
Kücükdeveci v Swedex GmbH & Co KG, Case C-555/07	220, 413
Kühn, Case C-177/90 [1992] ECR I-35.....	411
Laval un Partneri Ltd v Svenska Byggnadsarbetareförbundet [2008] IRLR 160, Case C-346/06, judgment of CJEU, 18 December 2007	83, 298, 308, 313, 329, 342, 359–60
Marschall v Land Nordrhein-Westfalen, Case C-409/95 [1997] ECR I-6363	378
Marshall, Case C-152/84 [1986] ECR 723.....	413
Nold v Commission, Case C-4/73 [1974] ECR 491	411
Omega v Oberbürgermeisterin der Bundesstadt Bonn, Case C-36/02 [2004] ECR I-9609.....	223
Pfeiffer at al v Deutsches Rotes Kreuz, Kreisverband Waldshut eV, Cases C-397/01 and C-403/01, 5 October 2004	413
Reimann, Case C-317/11	328
Rüffert, Case C-346/06, Case C-346/06 3 April 2008	313, 326
Schmidberger Internationale Transporte Planzüge v Republik Österreich, Case C-112/00 (2003) ECR I-5659	223, 343
Schultz-Hoff, Cases C-350/06 and C-520/06, 20 January 2009	328
Sindicato dos Bancários, Case C-128/12	330
UEAPME, Case T-135/963, 17 June 1998.....	320
Van Gend en Loos, Case C-26/62 [1963] ECR 1	412
VikingLine ABp v ITWF [2008] IRLR 14, Case C-438/05, judgment of CJEU, 11 December 2007.....	83, 308, 313, 359–60, 426
Von Colson, Case C-14/83 [1984] ECR 1891	412
Von Deetzen v Hauptzollamt Oldenburg, Case C-44/89 [1991] ECR I-5119.....	411
Wachauf v Germany, Case C-5/88 [1989] ECR 2609	411–12
Werhof v Freeway Traffic Systems, Case C-499/09, 9 March 2006	297
X v Commission, Case C-404/92, ECR 1994, I-4737.....	206
X v ECB, Case T-333/99 [2001]	248

Other International Courts/Tribunals

Inter-American Court of Human Rights, Advisory Opinion OC-5/85193	279
Japan v Russian Federation, International Tribunal for the Law of the Sea, 6 August 2007, Case No 14.....	29
Prosecutor v Kunarac, Vukovic and Kovac, 12 June 2002, ICTY.....	149

Other International Supervisory Bodies

ILO Freedom of Association Committee

Case no 28, UK-Jamaica, 2nd Report (1952)	334
---	-----

Case no 1618, Report no 287, June 1993	305
Case no 1730, Report no 294, June 1994	305
Case no 1852, Trade Union Congress v UK, Report no 309, March 1998	305
Case no 2199, Russian Labour Confederation (KTR) v Russian Federation, Report no 331.....	306
Case no 2265, Swiss Federation of Trade Unions (USS) v Switzerland Report no 335, Vol LXXXVII, 2004, Series B, No 3, Report no 343, Vol LXXXVIX, 2006, Series B, No 3	307
Case no 2326, Australia, Report No 338	324
Case no 2375, Peru, Report No 338	324

European Committee of Social Rights

1 September 2008, p 50	299
Collective complaint App No 11/2001 (European Council of Police Trade Unions v Portugal) 21 May 2002	315
Collective complaint App No 12/2002, (Confederation of Swedish Enterprise v Sweden), Report Decision on the merits	296, 300
Collective complaint App No 59/2009 (ETUC/Centrale Générale des Syndicats Libéraux de Belgique (CGSLB)/Confédération des Syndicats chrétiens de Belgique (CSC)/Fédération Générale du Travail de Belgique (FGTB) v Belgium).....	341, 344
Collective complaints App Nos 4/1999 (EUROFEDOP v Italy) and 5/1999 (EUROFEDOP v Portugal)	315
Conclusions 2002 and 2004, Romania.....	300
Conclusions 2006 Volume 2, Sweden.....	296
Conclusions 2010, Belgium.....	321
Conclusions 2010, Bulgaria.....	317
Conclusions 2010, Latvia.....	325
Conclusions 2010, Malta	318, 321
Conclusions 2010, Poland.....	316
Conclusions 2010, Portugal	317
Conclusions 2010, Romania	316
Conclusions I, p 31	315
Conclusions III, Germany.....	315
Conclusions XIII-3, 1995	302
Conclusions XIII-3, 1996	305–6
Conclusions XIII-5, 1997, Finland	296
Conclusions XIV-1 Vol 2, 1998	302
Conclusions XV-1, Belgium.....	318, 321, 331
Conclusions XV-1, France.....	317, 319, 321
Conclusions XV-1 Vol 2, 2000.....	302
Conclusions XVI-1, Belgium	358, 360, 365
Conclusions XVI-1 Vol 2, 2003	302, 305–6
Conclusions XVII-1, 2004, Belgium	302, 305–6
Conclusions XVIII-1 Vol 2, 2006	302, 305–6
Conclusions XVIII-1 Volume 1, 2006, Denmark.....	296
Conclusions XIX, Latvia	316

National Cases

Belgium

Antwerp Labour Court of Appeal, 17 March 2010, AR 2003/AA/353	243, 254
Brussels Labour Court of Appeal, 17th September 2003 Siedler v Western European Union	169
Buyle v BRT, Council of State, 4 December 1990	243
Buyle v BRT, Council of State, 21 September 1984	243
Constitutional Court, 13 October 2009, No 157/007	257
Cour de cassation, 2 June 2008, C.08.0215.N	176
Cour de cassation, 21 December 2009, C.03.0328.F	168
Cour de cassation, 27 February 2001, RW 2001–02	199
Court of Appeal of Brussels, 4 March 2003 (2003) <i>Journal des Tribunaux</i> 684	168
François v RTBF, Council of State, 13 January 1988	243
Labour Tribunal of Nivelles, 16 June 2004: (2004) <i>Journal des Tribunaux</i> 557	176
Leuven Labour Tribunal, 17 November 2011, (2012) 46 <i>Revue du Droit des Technologies de l'Information</i> 79	244

Canada

Attorney General of Ontario v Fraser, 2011 SCC 20	78
Health Services and Support—Facilities Subsector Bargaining Association v British Columbia, 2007 SCC 27, [2007] 2 SCR 391	17, 78, 83, 312
Multani v Commission scolaire Marguerite-Bourgeoys (2006) 1 SCR 256	122
Pepsi-Cola Canada Beverages (West) Ltd RWDSU v Local 558 2002 SCC 8	71
United Food and Commercial Workers, Local 401 v Alberta (Attorney General), 2012 ABCA 130	71

Denmark

Supreme Court, 21 January 2005, 22/2004	217
---	-----

France

Conseil Constitutionnel, 6 November 1996	323
Conseil Constitutionnel, 25 July 1989	323
Cour de cassation (Soc), 19 December 2003	176
Cour de Cassation, 17 July 1996	323
ESTAC v Juan-Luis Montero, Cour de Cassation, 28 April 2011	246
Nikon France v Onof, Cass Soc, 2 October 2001, No 4164	199
Spileers v SARL Omni Pac, Cass Soc 12 January 1999, D 1999, 635	199

Germany

Case No 1 BvR ('Luth'), BVerfGE (1958), vol 7, pp 189 <i>et seq</i>	139
Case Nos 2 BvR 1703/83, 1718/83 and 856/84, BVerfGE (1985), vol 70, pp. 138–73	124

Ireland

Ryanair Ltd v Labour Court and IMPACT, Appeal No 377/2005, Irish Supreme Court.....	327
--	-----

Netherlands

Hoge Raad, 30 May 1986, Nederlandse Jurisprudentie 1986, 688.....	358
JK Vloerverwarming BV v X, Arnhem Court, 11 April 2012, LJN BW2006	245
Rechtbank Utrecht 30 August 2007, LJN BB 2648; CrvB 7 mei 2009, LJL BI 2240.....	222, 226

South Africa

National Union of Metalworkers of South Africa, Constitutional Court of South Africa, judgment 13 December 2002, CCT 14/02.....	17
--	----

United Kingdom

Azmi v Kirklees Metropolitan Borough Council [2007] ICR 1154	217, 225, 233
Chaplin v Royal Devon & Exeter Hospital NHS Foundation Trust (2010) ET 1702886/2009	123
Eweida v British Airways plc (2010) EWCA Civ 80	123, 224
Ladele v Islington Borough Council [2009] EWCA Civ 1357	123, 226–7
McFarlane v Relate Avon Ltd (2010) EWCA Civ B1	123
Metrobus v UNITE the Union [2009] IRLR 851	74
R (on the application of Amicus—MSF and others) v Secretary of State for Trade and Industry and others [2004] EWHC 860 (Admin).....	228
R v Secretary of State for the Home Department, ex p Simms [2000] 2 AC 115.....	77
R v SK, [2011] England and Wales Court of Appeal (Criminal Division) 1691.....	149
Reilly and Wilson v Secretary of State for Work and Pensions [2012] EWHC 2292 (Admin).....	152

United States

Barenblatt v United States, 360 US 109, 126 (1959).....	131
Boy Scouts of America and Monmouth Council, et al. v Dale, 530 US 640 (2000).....	125–6
California v Greenwood, 486 US 35 (1988)	187
Hitchman Coal & Coke Co v Mitchell et al, 245 US 229, 263 (1917).....	110–12
Katz v US, 389 US 347 (1967).....	186–7
Miller v US, 425 US 435 (1976)	186
Roberts v United States Jaycees, 468 US 609, 622 (1984).....	125–6
Trans World Airlines, Inc. v Hardison, 432 US 63 (1977).....	122

Table of Legislation

Note that, as the entire work concerns the European Convention on Human Rights, only references to specific provisions are included in this Table.

International and European Instruments

African Charter on Human and Peoples' Rights	
Art 14.....	383
American Convention on Human Rights.....	7
Art 21.....	383
San Salvador Protocol	
Art 8.....	78
Arab Charter on Human Rights	
Art 31.....	383
Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union	
(CFREU).....	8, 37, 45, 48, 51, 75, 184, 206, 220, 287, 307, 309, 313, 369, 384, 411–12, 414
Preamble.....	419
Art 7.....	204
Art 8.....	204
Art 10.....	220
Art 11.....	238, 268
Art 12.....	313, 421
Art 12(1)	8, 287
Art 13.....	268
Art 17.....	383, 412–13
Art 21.....	209
Art 21(1)	369
Art 23.....	367, 369
Art 25.....	369
Art 28.....	8, 312–13, 327
Art 33(2)	35
Art 47.....	174
Art 52.....	206
Art 52(3)	412
Art 54(3)	377
Charter of Fundamental Social Rights of Workers (EU)	294, 418
Constitution of the International Labour Organization	
Art 19(2)	14
Art 19(8)	19, 42
Art 24.....	65, 68
Art 26.....	65
Convention for the Protection of Individuals with Regard to	
Automatic Processing of Personal Data 1981	204–6

Convention on Jurisdictional Immunities of States and their Property 2004.....	172–4
Art 11.....	173
Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination	
Against Women (CEDAW)	10, 367, 373, 378, 383
Art 2.....	373
Art 5.....	35
Art 11.....	368
Art 15(2)	383
Art 16.....	35
Art 16(1)(h).....	383
Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination.....	383
Art 5.....	383
Art 5(e).....	368
Convention on the Protection of Refugees	
Arts 14–15.....	383
Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (CRPD).....	10, 122, 369
Art 5(3)	122
Convention on the Rights of the Child (CRC).....	10, 109
Convention relating to Stateless Persons 1954	
Arts 13–14.....	383
Declaration of Philadelphia 1944	334, 418
Directive 77/187/EEC on the approximation of the laws of the Member	
States relating to the safeguarding of employees' rights in the event	
of transfers of undertakings, businesses or parts of businesses	297
Directive 94/45/EC on the establishment of a European Works Council	
Art 8.....	248
Directive 95/46/EC on the protection of individuals with regard to the	
processing of personal data and on the free movement of such data	33, 204–6
Directive 96/34/EC on the framework agreement on parental leave	
concluded by UNICE, CEEP and the ETUC	35
Directive 2000/43/EC implementing the principle of equal treatment	
between persons irrespective of racial or ethnic origin.....	120, 247, 363
Directive 2000/78/EC establishing a general framework for equal	
treatment in employment and occupation.....	33, 121, 209, 216–22, 224,
231, 233–5, 247, 363, 413, 425	
Art 2(2)(b)	217
Art 4.....	125, 216, 218
Art 4(1)	217, 219
Art 4(2)	123, 216–19, 231
Directive 2002/14/EC establishing a general framework for informing	
and consulting employees in the European Community.....	241
Directive 2003/109/EC concerning the status of third-country nationals	
who are long-term residents.....	369
Directive 2003/88/EC concerning certain aspects of the organisation of working time	
Art 6(2)	413
Art 7(1)	413
Directive 2006/54/EC on the implementation of the principle of equal opportunities	
and equal treatment	
Art 2(d)	248
Art 4.....	367

Directive 2010/18/EU implementing the revised Framework	
Agreement on parental leave.....	35
EU Accession Agreement.....	50, 54
Art 1.....	54
Art 2.....	55
Art 3.....	55
Art 4.....	55
Art 5.....	55
Art 7.....	56
Art 8.....	56
European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR)	
Preamble.....	10–11, 77, 104
Art 2.....	373, 376
Art 3.....	144, 194, 373, 376
Art 4.....	11, 108, 143–57, 376, 419–20, 428
Art 4(2)	151
Art 4(3)	151, 154–5
Art 4(3)(a)	153
Art 5.....	29, 144
Art 5(3)	29
Art 6.....	26, 29, 71, 85, 159–82, 257, 377, 427
Art 6(1)	161–3, 165–7, 170, 177, 180
Art 6(2)	181
Art 8.....	15, 32–3, 35, 38, 71, 84, 144, 183–208, 211, 230, 239, 244, 257, 371, 376, 386, 397, 429
Arts 8–11	130
Art 8(1)	183–5, 188–9, 191–5, 197, 200, 206, 371
Art 8(2)	138, 183–5, 188–9, 192–5, 197–202, 205–7
Art 9.....	35, 124–5, 138, 196, 209–35, 239, 291, 424
Art 9(2)	210, 213–16
Art 10.....	36–7, 39, 71, 77, 84, 125, 132, 237–86, 291
Art 10(1)	262
Art 10(2)	241, 248–50, 258
Art 10(2))	202
Art 11.....	3–4, 6, 9, 11, 21, 24, 27–8, 37–40, 63, 69, 71, 73–4, 77, 79–80, 111, 113–14, 124–6, 138, 155, 196, 215, 239, 252, 257, 276, 278, 281, 283, 287–365, 375–6, 391, 402, 406, 418, 420–2, 426, 428
Art 11(1)	64, 71, 74, 79–82, 127, 303
Art 11(2)	73–4, 78–84, 278, 291, 316, 335, 338, 345, 351–2, 357–9
Art 13.....	194, 377
Art 14.....	15, 28, 40, 42, 71, 194, 209, 306, 333, 335, 349, 367–79, 400, 422
Art 15.....	144
Art 22.....	11, 54, 56
Art 23.....	11
Art 23(2)	99
Art 24.....	11
Art 25.....	11
Art 26.....	86, 90
Art 30.....	90, 99

Art 33.....	55
Art 34.....	62–3, 200
Art 35.....	86, 98, 427
Art 35(1)	66, 70, 84
Art 35(2)(b)	65–8, 85
Art 35(3)(b)	63, 98–9
Art 35(3b)	25
Art 36.....	88
Art 41.....	85
Art 43.....	91
Art 44(2)	43
Art 46.....	103
Art 46(2)	56
Arts 47–49.....	100
Art 53.....	162, 377
Art 57.....	16, 55
Art 59(2)	49
Art 60.....	75
Protocol 1.....	54
Art 1	28, 40, 43, 62, 82, 84, 299, 342, 370, 376, 381–414
Art 2	378
Protocol 4, Art 2(3)	130
Protocol 6.....	54
Protocol 11.....	93
Protocol 12.....	119, 379
Art 1	379
Protocol 14.....	25, 49–50, 93, 98
Protocol 15.....	96–9
Art 1	97
Protocol 16.....	100
European Social Charter (ESC)	3–4, 6, 8, 10–11, 16, 18, 27, 34, 38, 65–6, 75–7, 82, 111, 156, 190, 207, 287, 290–1, 300, 307, 309, 312, 314, 334, 341, 350, 353, 358, 360, 369, 405, 407, 409, 418
Art 2.....	156
Art 4(3)	369
Art 4(5)	409
Art 5.....	8, 15, 287, 291, 294, 302, 334, 350
Art 6.....	8, 15, 309, 325, 334, 354
Art 6(2)	312, 316, 325, 339
Art 6(4)	83, 334, 342, 359
Art 12.....	43
Art 12(3)	43
Art 12(4)	15
Art 15.....	369
Art 31.....	83, 359, 365
Art 32.....	20
First Additional Protocol	369
Appendix.....	156

Art 1(2)	291
Geneva Convention relating to the Status of Refugees, 1951.....	34
Art 23.....	34
ILO Convention No 29 (Forced or Compulsory Labour)	9, 109, 151, 154
Art 2.....	155
ILO Convention No 87 (Freedom of Association and Protection of the Right to Organize).....	7, 17, 24, 40, 277, 287, 290, 294, 300–1, 305, 313, 339, 349, 360, 405, 421
Art 2.....	24
Art 3.....	24, 301–2
Art 3(1)	66
Art 5.....	302
Art 8.....	24
Art 9.....	350
Art 10.....	335, 354
Art 11.....	24
ILO Convention No 97 (Migration for Employment—Revised).....	369
Art 6.....	369
ILO Convention No 98 (Application of the Principles of the Right to Organize and to Bargain Collectively).....	7, 16, 40, 66, 277, 287, 290, 294, 305, 309, 313, 315, 325–7, 351
Art 3.....	363
Art 4.....	326
ILO Convention No 100 (Equal Remuneration)	367–8
ILO Convention No 102 (Social Security—Minimum Standards)	43
ILO Convention No 111 (Discrimination in Employment and Occupation).....	34, 190, 252, 368
Art 1.....	35
ILO Convention No 122 (Employment Policy)	
Art 1.....	121
ILO Convention No 143 (Migrant Workers—Supplementary Provisions).....	369
Art 9(1)	369
ILO Convention No 151 (Protection of the Right to Organise and Procedures for Determining Conditions of Employment in the Public Service).....	7, 277, 309
ILO Convention No 154 (Promotion of Collective Bargaining)	
Art 2.....	309, 325
Art 5.....	309
ILO Convention No 158 (Termination of Employment).....	36–7, 40
Art 5.....	269–70
ILO Convention No 159 (Vocational Rehabilitation and Employment—Disabled Persons).....	369
ILO Convention No 175 (Part-Time Work)	411
ILO Convention No 177 (Home Work)	411
ILO Convention No 189 (Domestic Work)	147, 411
International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of their Families (ICRMW).....	10, 369, 378
Art 15.....	383
International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR).....	17, 75, 220, 238, 249, 287, 368

Art 2.....	368
Art 18.....	209
Art 19.....	238, 241, 248
Art 19(1)	249–50
Art 19(3)	249–50
Art 20.....	249–50
Art 22.....	350
Art 22(1)	287
International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR).....	10, 65, 75, 77, 190, 349–50, 368, 383, 422
Art 2.....	368
Art 2(2)	27, 34
Art 3.....	368
Art 6.....	34, 121
Art 8.....	335, 350, 354, 421
Art 8((1)	287
Art 8(1)(a)	27
Art 8(1)(d)	24
Art 9.....	42
Art 15(c).....	383
Lisbon Treaty.....	8, 49, 51, 54, 59, 220, 377
Protocol No 8.....	51
Art 1	50
Art 1(b).....	52
Art 2	50
Art 3	50
Revised European Social Charter (RESC).....	11, 16, 34–7, 44–5, 287, 341, 369, 407–11, 421
Art 1.....	407
Art 1(2)	34
Art 2(2)	407
Art 2(3)	407
Art 4.....	407
Art 5.....	16, 335, 349, 354, 407, 421
Art 6.....	16, 341
Art 6(2)	16
Art 6(4)	341, 409
Art 7(5)	407
Art 8(1)	407
Art 12.....	34, 42, 44
Art 12(4)	43
Art 15.....	369
Art 19.....	369
Art 19(4)–(5)	407
Art 24.....	36, 40
Art 25.....	410
Art 27(2)	35
Art A	16
Art E.....	368
Art H.....	20

Rules of Court of the European Court of Human Rights	61–2, 101
Annex to the Rules, Rules A1–A8.....	69
Rule 27A.....	86
Rule 34(4).....	88
Rule 36.....	62
Rule 39.....	62
Rule 41.....	90
Rule 44(1)(b).....	86
Rule 44(3).....	88
Rule 44(5).....	88
Rule 47.....	62
Rule 54(2)(b).....	86
Rule 61(1).....	90
Rule 72.....	90, 99
Rule 72(4).....	99
Rule 73.....	91
Rule 74.....	90
Rule 75.....	85
Rule 80.....	90
Staff Regulations of Officials of the European Communities	
Art 17(2).....	265
Statute of the International Court of Justice	
Art 38(1)(c).....	13
Supplementary Convention on the Abolition of Slavery, the Slave	
Trade, and Institutions and Practices Similar to Slavery.....	109
Treaty of Rome	
Art 13.....	209
Treaty on European Union (TEU)	49–50, 314
Art 3(3).....	314
Art 6.....	50, 75
Art 6(1).....	8
Art 6(2).....	49, 51, 53, 59, 238
Art 17(1).....	33
Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union (TFEU)	100, 315, 367, 412
Art 45.....	412
Art 152.....	315
Art 157.....	413
Art 157(1).....	367
Art 218(8).....	49
Art 267.....	100
Art 344.....	50
Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR)	10–11, 287, 290, 334, 367, 419
Art 2.....	368
Art 17.....	382
Art 18.....	209
Art 20(2).....	287, 294
Art 23(4).....	287
Art 27(2).....	383
Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties (VCLT).....	17, 21, 25
Art 2(1)(d).....	16
Art 5.....	12–13

Art 31.....	12
Arts 31–33.....	6, 12, 72
Art 31(3)	13
Art 31(3)(b)	18
Art 31(3)(c)	13, 15–16
Arts 81 ff.....	12
Art 85.....	14

National Instruments

Belgium

Code on civil procedure	
Art 300	175
Judicial Code	
Art 199	175
Art 216	175

Canada

Charter of Rights and Freedoms	
s 15(1).....	122

Estonia

Law on Employment Contracts 1992	
Art 7	218

France

Code du Travail	
Art L 411-2.....	348
Art L 2253, §§ 1 and 2.....	323
Constitution 1946	313
Constitution 1958	313
Waldeck-Rousseau Act	348

Germany

Basic Law	118, 124, 311
Art 2	118
Art 2(1).....	124
Art 9(3).....	311
Art 140	124
Civil Code (BGB)	
s 826	139
Weimar Constitution 1919	
Art 137(2).....	124
Art 137(3).....	124
Works Constitution Act (Betriebsverfassungsgesetz)	
§ 2	345
§ 118	126

Ireland

Employment Equality Act 1998–2004	
s 37(1).....	218

Italy

Decree number 138	
Art 8	323–4

Romania

Labour Code	
Art 130(j).....	181

Spain

Law No 4/80 of 10 January 1980 on the status of radiodiffusion and television	128
Royal Legislative Decree No 1/1995 of 24 March 1995	128

United Kingdom

Asylum and Immigration (Treatment of Claimants) Act 2004	
ss 4(1) and 5	149
Coroners and Justice Act 2009	
s 71	147
Equality Act 2010	
sch 9, para 2	228
Sex Discrimination Act 1975	170
Trade Union and Labour Relations (Consolidation) Act 1992.....	338, 364
pt I	63
s 1	348
s 244	353

United States

Civil Rights Act 1964	
Title VII	122
Constitution	
First Amendment	125–6, 131, 221, 247
Fourth Amendment.....	186–7
National Labour Relations Act	
s 7	326
s 9	318

General Part

The New Social Dimension in the Jurisprudence of the European Court of Human Rights (ECtHR): The Demir and Baykara Judgment, its Methodology and Follow-up¹

KLAUS LÖRCHER

Un jour, je l'espère, l'objectif que se rapprochent les droits civils et politiques et les droits économiques et sociaux sera atteint. C'est l'intérêt de tous.
(*Jean Costa*, Former President of the ECtHR, 18 October 2011, on the occasion of the 50th anniversary of the European Social Charter)

IN A GLOBALISED economy rocked by (financial) crises at increasingly short intervals, the problem facing all sections of society with regard to their rights and interests is becoming more and more acute. The European Convention of Human Rights (hereinafter the Convention or the ECHR), until now seen mainly as an instrument for ensuring civil and political rights, has been given an important push by recent European Court of Human Rights (hereinafter the Court or the ECtHR) case law giving it a more socially oriented dimension.

The *Demir and Baykara* judgment of November 2008² can be considered as *the* landmark case³ in this respect. It not only provides freedom of association

¹ Certain parts of this contribution are based on N Bruun and K Lörcher, 'Social Innovation: The New ECHR Jurisprudence and its Impact on Fundamental Social Rights in Labour Law' in I Schömann (ed), *Mélanges à la mémoire de Yota Kravaritou: A Trilingual Tribute* (Brussels, ETUI, 2011) 335 ff, though further developed and updated.

² ECtHR (Grand Chamber [GC]) (12 November 2008), App No 34503/97, *Demir and Baykara v Turkey* [2008] ECHR 1345. The substantive consequences of this judgment on Article 11 ECHR will be dealt with under Section 4.3.6. However, it should be noted from the outset that a first judgment in this case was handed down by a Chamber of the Second Section (21 November 2006), a judgment against which the Turkish government appealed to the Grand Chamber. For the sake of simplicity, any subsequent mention in this contribution of *Demir and Baykara* will, in the absence of further specification, refer to the Grand Chamber's judgment of November 2008.

³ See, for example, K Ewing and J Hendy, 'The Dramatic Implications of *Demir and Baykara*' (2010) 39(1) *ILJ* 1; V Wedl, 'Neues aus der Judikatur des EGMR zu gewerkschaftlichen Grundrechten', (2009) *Das Recht der Arbeit* 458 ff; J-P Marguénaud and J Mouly, 'La Cour européenne des droits de l'homme à la conquête du droit de grève—A propos de l'arrêt de Chambre de la Cour européenne des droits de l'homme *Enerji Yapi Yol Sen c. Turquie* du 21 avril 2009' (2009) *Revue du Droit du Travail* 502 ff;

(Article 11 ECHR) with real content by explicitly recognising the right to bargain collectively (in contrast to its previous jurisprudence),⁴ it also opens up the whole ECHR to a more socially oriented interpretation,⁵ mainly by referring to international (labour) standards.⁶ This chapter aims to look into this methodological approach in greater detail.

1 INTRODUCTION

Methodology in legal matters is a challenging exercise, in particular when it comes to human rights and even more so when the relation to international standards is at stake. It is in this context that the *Demir and Baykara* judgment is placed and has therefore to be analysed.

It might appear strange that this judgment should deserve such attention. Out of the approximately 15,000 judgments handed down by the Court since its establishment

K Lörcher, 'Das Menschenrecht auf Kollektivverhandlung und Streik—auch für Beamte (Zu den Urteilen ... *Demir und Baykara* und ... *Enerji Yapi-Yol-Sen*)' (2009) *AuR* 299 ff; Comments by *Dorsemont* and *Gerards*, *European Human Rights Cases (EHRC)* 2009, pp 65 ff; S Van Drooghenbroek, 'Les frontières du droit et le temps juridique: La Cour européenne des droits de l'homme repousse les limites, Cour européenne des droits de l'homme (Grande Chambre), *Demir et Baykara c. Turquie*, 12 novembre 2008' (2009) *Revue Trimestrielle des Droits de l'Homme* 811 ff. More critical points of view (in particular in relation to the methodology used) are expressed by J-F Cohen-Jonathan and G Flauss, 'La Cour européenne des droits de l'homme et le droit international' (2008) *Annuaire français de droit international* 529; A Seifert, 'Recht auf Kollektivverhandlungen und Streikrecht für Beamte. Anmerkungen zur neuen Rechtsprechung des EGMR zur Vereinigungsfreiheit' (2009) *KritV* 357 ff; ATJM Jacobs and J van Drongelen, 'Nieuwe vleugels voor de vakverenigingsvrijheid van art. 11 EVRM' (2009) 84(36) *Nederlands Juristenblad* 2345 ff. For a more recent general analysis of the interpretation approaches used by the ECtHR, see the special issue of the 'Revue Générale de Droit International Public' ((2011) 115(2) with 'Dossier *Les techniques interprétatives de la norme internationale*') and H Senden, *Interpretation of Fundamental Rights in a Multilevel Legal System—An Analysis of the European Court of Human Rights and the Court of Justice of the European Union* (Cambridge, Intersentia, 2011).

⁴ In a more general perspective, see F Dorsemont, 'The Right to Form and to Join Trade Unions for the Protection of His Interests under Article 11 of the European Convention on Human Rights—An Attempt "to Digest" the Case Law (1975–2009) of the European Court on Human Rights' (2010) 2 *European Labour Law Journal* 185 ff.

⁵ The contributions on the substantive articles of the ECHR will deal with this aspect in greater detail. Concerning the Court's increasing case law on social rights and issues, see, eg: R Allen, R Crasnow and A Beale, *Employment Law and Human Rights*, 2nd edn (Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2007); L Caflisch, 'Labour issues before the Strasbourg Court' in ILO (ed), *The Distinguished Scholars Series*, <http://www.ilo.org/public/english/bureau/leg/download/series.pdf>; J-P Marguénaud and J Mouly, 'Cour Européenne des Droits de l'Homme et droit du travail' presentation, Paris, 21 March 2008; E Palmer, *Judicial Review, Socio-Economic Rights and the Human Rights Act* (Oxford, Hart Publishing, 2007).

⁶ See also the former ECtHR's president, Costa, in respect of the Court's references to the European Social Charter: 'D'abord, la Convention a fait des incursions sur le terrain de la Charte sociale (principalement dans le domaine du travail et du droit syndical). Ensuite, notre Cour s'est livrée à une utilisation extensive de l'article 14 de la Convention européenne des droits de l'homme en faveur des droits économiques et sociaux. Enfin, elle cite de plus en plus fréquemment la Charte sociale dans ses arrêts, pour s'en inspirer'. 18 October 2011, speech on the occasion of the 50th anniversary of the European Social Charter, p 2, http://www.coe.int/t/dghl/monitoring/socialcharter/Activities/50anniversary/SpeechCostaCeremony50Ann_en.pdf, 15 ff. For a more general analysis of the Court's case law referring to Council of Europe treaties, see European Court of Human Rights (Research Division) (ed), *The Use of Council of Europe Treaties in the Case Law of the European Court of Human Rights*, Council of Europe, European Court of Human Rights, Strasbourg, June 2011 http://www.echr.coe.int/Documents/Research_report_treaties_CoE_ENG.pdf.

in the late 1950s,⁷ it is the one to which most attention is devoted in this chapter. This is due to several factors: it constituted an open reversal of previous jurisprudence (a rare fact in judicial history), it was adopted by the Grand Chamber, the decision was taken unanimously and—in the context of this contribution the most important element—it develops an internationally oriented interpretation methodology with binding ('must') character.

This chapter attempts to analyse the explicit methodological considerations presented by the Court in that judgment, exploring the extent to which the ECHR may indeed be of relevance for (different) social rights by discussing three main questions: first, the main essence of the Court's methodology is clarified (Section 2); second, the criticism raised against this methodology is examined (Section 3); third, the follow-up of this approach is explored—has the Court applied this methodology in its subsequent practice, in particular with regard to social issues or rights (Section 4)?; and, finally, a number of conclusions are provided (Section 5).

2 THE METHODOLOGY: INTERPRETING THE ECHR IN LINE WITH INTERNATIONAL (LABOUR) STANDARDS (THE 'DEMIR AND BAYKARA APPROACH')

In *Demir and Baykara* the Court adopted a clearly defined attitude to economic and social rights by its explicit and unprecedented use of a consolidated approach to interpreting the Convention by means of systematic reference to international (labour) standards. In the Court's own language, the message could be called 'Interpretation of the Convention in the light of other international instruments'.⁸ In her recent in-depth analysis of the Court's interpretation methods and principles, Hanneke Senden also acknowledges the great importance of this judgment in respect of 'comparative' methodology.⁹

2.1 Development of its Approach

How did the Court proceed? On the basis of the description and analysis of previous jurisprudence, it developed a consolidated methodology by way of systematic reference to international (labour) standards and the case law of their respective supervisory bodies.

⁷ The 'old' Court delivered fewer than 1,000 judgments. The number of judgments delivered by the new Court exceeds 14,000. *European Court of Human Rights—Annual Report 2011* (Strasbourg, 2012), p 12.

⁸ As heading II.A. It appears at least surprising that Cohen-Jonathan and Flauss (n 3) qualify this heading as 'intitulé didactique' (532), thus diminishing if not rejecting its legal value.

⁹ 'Only on rare occasions, such as in the Grand Chamber judgment *Demir and Baykara*, does the Court extensively discuss its use of the comparative method': Senden (n 3) 224. Attributing references to international (human rights) standards to a 'comparative' method would, however, appear to be questionable. To answer this (more terminological) question is not the purpose of this contribution and will therefore not be developed further here.

2.1.1 Basic Interpretation Principles

In §§ 65–68 of *Demir and Baykara*, the Court describes the basics of its interpretation approach, ie, the respective general interpretation rules contained in Articles 31–33 of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties (VCLT) (§ 65),¹⁰ the necessity of interpreting ECHR rights in a manner making them ‘practical and effective’ (§ 66), the consideration of references to international law for interpretation purposes (§ 67) (sometimes called the ‘consensus method’) and, finally, that the Convention is a ‘living’ instrument (§ 68). One might assume that these principles are separate and that the third (references to international law in § 67) had no outstanding importance. Though all interlinked, it is this third principle to which the Court now attaches greater importance than in the past, as reflected by the heading of this section of the judgment (‘The practice of interpreting Convention provisions in the light of other international texts and instruments’) with no further mention of the other principles. However, this becomes obvious when looking at the further reasoning (§§ 69 ff).

2.1.2 Description of the Relevant Case Law in Respect of International Instruments

The starting point in the description of the Court’s case law is the term ‘Diversity’ (of international texts and instruments used for the interpretation of the Convention). This can be seen as confirming the assumption that the Court had no systematic point of view on this element prior to *Demir and Baykara*. Describing first the previous jurisprudence referring to ‘General international law’ (§§ 69–73) and then highlighting the specific role of ‘Council of Europe instruments’ (§§ 74 and 75), the Court continues with a more analytical section (‘Consideration by the Court’). In § 76 it refers to the ‘rules and principles ... accepted by the vast majority of States’ and in § 77 to the case law of the supervisory organs of the European Social Charter (ESC).¹¹ It goes on to clarify that it has ‘never distinguished between sources of law according to whether or not they have been signed or ratified by the respondent State’ (§ 78) by quoting relevant case law (§§ 79–83).

2.2 Three Elements to which Reference is Made and their Degree of Relevance as ‘Conclusions’

Under the heading ‘Conclusions’, the Court summarises its methodology in §§ 85–86.¹² These two paragraphs are quoted in full on account of their eminent importance. It is

¹⁰ In ss 2 and 3, references to §§ without further specification refer to paragraphs in the *Demir and Baykara* judgment.

¹¹ It is interesting to note that the two cases mentioned here pertain to Article 11 ECHR (*Sigurður A Sigurjónsson v Iceland*, 30 June 1993, § 35, Series A, No 264; and *Sørensen and Rasmussen v Denmark* [GC], App Nos 52562/99 and 52620/99, §§ 72–75, (2006) ECHR 24).

¹² See F Tulkens, ‘Introduction to the Seminar Dialogue between Judges 2009’ in European Court of Human Rights (ed), *Fifty Years of the European Court of Human Rights viewed by its fellow International Courts* (Strasbourg, 2009) 13.

on the basis of these conclusions that the methodology will be described below (and the criticism examined later):

85 The Court, in defining the meaning of terms and notions in the text of the Convention, *can and must take into account elements of international law* other than the Convention, the *interpretation* of such elements *by competent organs*, and the *practice of European States* reflecting their common values. The consensus emerging from specialised international instruments and from the practice of Contracting States may constitute a relevant consideration for the Court when it interprets the provisions of the Convention in specific cases.

86 In this context, it is *not necessary for the respondent State to have ratified* the entire collection of instruments that are applicable in respect of the precise subject matter of the case concerned. It will be sufficient for the Court that the relevant international instruments denote a continuous evolution in the norms and principles applied in international law or in the domestic law of the majority of member States of the Council of Europe and show, in a precise area, that there is common ground in modern societies ... (Emphasis added)

Accordingly, the ECtHR's methodology involves taking into account three main elements:

- (1) elements of international law;
- (2) the interpretation of such elements by competent organs;
- (3) the practice of Council of Europe Member States.

These elements will now be examined further, before analysing the *Demir and Baykara* judgment with regard to whether the Court (and in the affirmative to which extent) applies these elements in the interpretation of the Convention in its later case law.

2.2.1 Reference to 'Elements of International Law' Irrespective of Ratification

This reference is obviously the most important and far-reaching element of this judgment.

2.2.1.1 'Elements of International Law'

Under this term, the Court not only understands universally applicable (ie, the UN or the International Labour Organization (ILO)) treaties but even non-European ones such as the American Convention on Human Rights (§ 72). Furthermore, it points out that it has also referred to 'intrinsically non-binding instruments of Council of Europe organs' (§ 74), ie, a vast array of instruments.

In the case at hand, the Court takes into account at a universal level ILO Conventions 87,¹³ 98¹⁴ and 151,¹⁵ giving them priority over the two UN Covenants

¹³ See the references to the Freedom of Association and Protection of the Right to Organise Convention 1948 (No 87) in *Demir and Baykara* (n 2) §§ 37, 100, 122 (the reference in §§ 123–25 and 152 are more of a factual nature).

¹⁴ See the references to the Right to Organise and Collective Bargaining Convention 1949 (No 98) in *Demir and Baykara* (n 2) §§ 42, 147, 165, 166.

¹⁵ See the references to the Labour Relations (Public Service) Convention 1978 (No 151) in *Demir and Baykara* (n 2) §§ 44, 148, 165.

on Civil and Political Rights¹⁶ and on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights,¹⁷ and at a European level the European Social Charter.¹⁸ As non-binding instruments, a Council of Europe Recommendation¹⁹ and the EU Charter of Fundamental Rights²⁰ are mentioned. The Court thus follows in full its own criteria.

2.2.1.2 ‘Irrespective of Ratification’

Looking at the case law quoted in §§ 79–83, the Court has ‘never’ made a distinction as to whether a treaty has been ratified or not.²¹ Therefore, it is logical that the Court concludes that ‘(i)t is sufficient for the Court that the relevant international instruments denote a continuous evolution in the norms and principles applied in international law or in the domestic law of the majority of Member States’ (§ 86). It is this element which is perhaps the most criticised (see below, 3.2.1.2).

On the basis of the set of arguments put forward in §§ 65 ff and §§ 79–83 in particular, the Turkish government’s objection (§§ 54 and 62) on the grounds of Turkey not having accepted either Article 5 or 6 ESC²² were rejected by the Court.

2.2.2 *Reference to ‘the Interpretation of Such Elements by Competent Organs’* (Case Law of the Relevant Supervisory Organs)

It is important to recall that the Court, in interpreting the ECHR, refers not only to the standards as such but also to the case law of the respective supervisory organs established to review the conformity of national situations with respect to international (labour) standards. As justification, the Court refers to previous jurisprudence (§ 77).

Looking at the case at hand, the Court refers to the ILO’s Committee of Experts on the Application of Conventions and Recommendations (CEACR)²³ and the Committee on Freedom of Association (CFA),²⁴ as well as the Council of Europe’s European Committee of Social Rights (ECSR).²⁵

2.2.3 *Reference to ‘the Practice of European States’*

As the third element needing to be taken into account in the Court’s interpretation of the Convention, the ‘practice of European States reflecting their common values’

¹⁶ See the references in *Demir and Baykara* (n 2) §§ 40, 99, 122, 124.

¹⁷ See the references in *ibid*.

¹⁸ See the references in *Demir and Baykara* (n 2) to Article 5 in §§ 45, 103, 122; and to Article 6 in §§ 49, 149, 165.

¹⁹ See the references in *Demir and Baykara* (n 2) on the status of public officials in Europe in §§ 46 and 104.

²⁰ See the references in *Demir and Baykara* (n 2) to Article 12(1) in §§ 47, 105, 122; and to Article 28 in §§ 51, 150, 165. At the time of publication of this judgment, the Lisbon Treaty making this Charter legally binding (by virtue of the (new) Article 6(1) TEU) was not yet in force.

²¹ The main authority to which the Court refers in § 79 is the *Marckx v Belgium* (GC) judgment. The importance is underlined by the fact that this is the only judgment to which the Court refers in its conclusions on the interpretation methodology (§§ 85 and 86).

²² See the references in *Demir and Baykara* (n 2) § 149 (concerning Article 6 ESC).

²³ See the references in *ibid*, §§ 38, 43, 101, 122, 147, 166.

²⁴ See the references in *ibid*, §§ 38, 102, 122; see also subsequent (Fifth Section) judgment (30 July 2009), App No 67336/01, *Danilenkov and others v Russia*, § 130.

²⁵ See the references in *Demir and Baykara* (n 2) §§ 50, 149.

(§ 85) is mentioned. It is first interesting to note that the Court does not quote previous case law to justify this element. Second, the Court would have to examine not only the practice as such but also to which extent it reflects ‘their common values’. Third, there is a close link to the acceptance of international instruments by the Council of Europe Member States inasmuch as this is also an element of ‘practice’ of these States.

Accordingly, in later sections of this judgment, the Court describes in brief the practice in European Council of Europe Member States, including the interpretation and application process.²⁶

2.2.4 Degree of Relevance: ‘Can and Must Take into Account’

The Court not only mentions the three elements of (internationally oriented) interpretation but also defines their relevance in the process of interpretation. The main message here is that these elements not only ‘can’ but also ‘must’ be taken into account. This self-obligation is far-reaching: taking this statement literally—a normal assumption for a judgment—it means that in *all* applications in which it has to interpret the Convention (‘defining the meaning of terms and notions in the text of the Convention’: § 85), the Court has to search for and find all elements of international law and practice relevant for the specific problem to be solved. This is the first step towards ‘taking into account’ what follows and consists of carefully examining the contents of these elements and weighing up their relevance.

It will probably be at this stage that the somewhat contradictory wording ‘may constitute’ will come into play. Indeed, it would appear that the main purpose of the whole examination exercise is to find out whether there is a common denominator (‘consensus emerging’, ‘continuous evolution’: § 85).

In any event, in the case at hand the Court not only took account of but also based its whole decision on the elements described. Their relevance for the decision-making process (aimed at reversing previous jurisprudence on Article 11 ECHR) could not be demonstrated better.

2.3 New or Consolidated Approach?

Does this constitute a new approach? One might negate this by pointing out that in its previous case law, as quite extensively demonstrated, the Court had already referred to international (even non-binding) standards and also—to a certain extent—to the case law of relevant bodies.²⁷ Interestingly enough, such references had been used by the Court even in certain cases pertaining to social rights.²⁸ This aspect of the methodology may thus be considered as already well established.

²⁶ See the references in *ibid*, concerning the right to organise in §§ 48 and 106, and the right to bargain collectively in 52, 151 and 165.

²⁷ See the references to previous case law in *Demir and Baykara* (n 2) §§ 67 ff; see later reference to *Demir and Baykara* in ECtHR (First Section) judgment (15 January 2009), App No 42454/02, *Menchinskaya v Russia*, § 34.

²⁸ See the references in *Demir and Baykara* (n 2), *inter alia* § 70 to the ILO Forced Labour Convention (No 29) in the ECtHR (Second Section) judgment (26 July 2005), App No 73316/01, *Siliadin v France* [2005] ECHR 545, § 85.