

THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT AUSTIN
STUDIES IN FOREIGN AND TRANSNATIONAL LAW

HANS-JOACHIM CREMER
*HUMAN RIGHTS AND THE PROTECTION
OF PRIVACY IN TORT LAW*
*A COMPARISON BETWEEN ENGLISH AND
GERMAN LAW*

HUMAN RIGHTS AND THE PROTECTION OF PRIVACY IN TORT LAW

In its case law, the European Court of Human Rights has acknowledged that national courts are bound to give effect to Article 8 of the European Convention of Human Rights (ECHR), which sets out the right to private and family life, when they rule on controversies between private individuals. Article 8 of the ECHR has thus been accorded *mittelbare Drittwirkung* or indirect 'third-party' effect in private law relationships.

The German law of privacy, centring on the 'allgemeines Persönlichkeitsrecht', has quite a long history, and the influence of the European Court of Human Rights' interpretation of the ECHR has led to a strengthening of privacy protection in the German law. This book considers how English courts could possibly use and adapt structures adopted by the German legal order in response to rulings from the European Court of Human Rights to strengthen the protection of privacy in the private sphere.

Hans-Joachim Cremer is Professor of Public Law and Legal Philosophy at the University of Mannheim since 2000. He earned his doctorate at the University of Heidelberg. His dissertation on legal protection against expulsion and deportation won the University's Ruprecht Karls Award in 1995. In 1999 he completed his *Habilitation* at Heidelberg. His post-doctoral thesis investigates the methodology of constitutional interpretation.

The University of Texas at Austin

Studies in Foreign and Transnational Law

General Editors: Sir Basil Markesinis and Dr Jörg Fedtke

The UT Studies in Foreign and Transnational Law series aims to publish books covering various aspects of foreign, private, criminal and public law, as well as transnational law. This broad ambition of the Series underlines the General Editors' belief that in a shrinking world there is a growing need to expand our knowledge of other legal orders – national or supranational – and to publish books discussing comparative methodology rather than mere descriptions of foreign systems.

Titles in the Series

The French Civil Code

J.-L. Halpérin, transl. T. Weir (2006)

Judicial Recourse to Foreign Law

B. Markesinis and J. Fedtke (2006)

International Negotiation in the Twenty-First Century

A. Plantey, transl. F. Meadows (2007)

Civil Disobedience and the German Courts

P. Quint (2007)

Human Rights in the Private Sphere

D. Oliver & J. Fedtke (2007)

Italian Private Law

G. Alpa & V. Zeno-Zencovich (2007)

Freedom of Expression

V. Zeno-Zencovich (2008)

Pure Economic Loss

V. Valentine Palmer (2008)

Introduction to Spanish Private Law

T. Rodríguez de las Heras Ballell (2009)

HUMAN RIGHTS AND THE PROTECTION OF PRIVACY IN TORT LAW

A Comparison between English
and German Law

Hans-Joachim Cremer



Routledge·Cavendish
Taylor & Francis Group
LONDON AND NEW YORK

First published 2011 by Routledge-Cavendish
2 Park Square, Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxon, OX14 4RN
Simultaneously published in the USA and Canada
by Routledge-Cavendish
270 Madison Avenue, New York, NY 10016

This edition published in the Taylor & Francis e-Library, 2010.

To purchase your own copy of this or any of Taylor & Francis or Routledge's
collection of thousands of eBooks please go to www.eBookstore.tandf.co.uk.

Routledge-Cavendish is an imprint of the Taylor & Francis Group,
an informa business

© 2011 Hans-Joachim Cremer

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reprinted or
reproduced or utilised in any form or by any electronic,
mechanical, or other means, now known or hereafter
invented, including photocopying and recording, or in any
information storage or retrieval system, without permission in
writing from the publishers.

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data
A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

Library of Congress Cataloguing in Publication Data
Cremer, Hans-Joachim.

Human rights and the protection of privacy in tort law: a comparison between English and
German law / Hans-Joachim Cremer.
p. cm.

1. Privacy, Right of—Germany. 2. Human rights—Germany. 3. Privacy,
Right of—England. 4. Human rights—England. 5. International and municipal
law—Germany. 6. International and municipal law—England. I. Title.

KJC1676.C74 2010
342.7308'58—dc22
2010009716

ISBN 0-203-84357-6 Master e-book ISBN

ISBN10: 0-415-47704-2 (hbk)
ISBN13: 978-0-415-47704-8 (hbk)

ISBN10: 0-203-84357-6 (ebk)
ISBN13: 978-0-203-84357-4 (ebk)

<i>Table of cases</i>	xiii
<i>Table of legislation</i>	xxviii
<i>Foreword</i>	xxxii
<i>Preface</i>	xxxiii
<i>Abbreviations</i>	xxxvi

Chapter 1: Aspects of comparison and the European Convention on Human Rights in the context of German law	1
1.1 Intrusions, disturbances, unwelcome publications	1
1.2 Outline of the book	6
1.3 Comparative aspects of the study	7
1.3.1 The comparative setting	7
1.3.2 The practical utility of legal comparisons	8
1.3.2.1 Comparisons required by law	8
1.3.2.2 The need for legal comparisons in the context of the European Convention on Human Rights	10
1.3.2.2.1 Compliance with the Convention	10
1.3.2.2.2 The relevance of ECtHR judgments and the need to compare	12
1.3.2.2.2.1 First example: The <i>accessione invertita</i> under Italian law and the functioning of British rules on the limitation of land recovery actions	13
1.3.2.2.2.2 Second example: Deprivation of liberty and medication in a private psychiatric clinic without consent	16
1.4 The German courts and the ECHR	23

1.4.1	The implementation of the ECHR and its status and rank in German law	23
1.4.2	The <i>Görgülü</i> decision of the <i>Bundesverfassungsgericht</i>	25
1.4.2.1	The facts of the case as decided by the ECtHR	25
1.4.2.2	Effects of an ECtHR judgment according to the Convention as exemplified by the ECtHR's <i>Görgülü</i> judgment	25
1.4.2.3	The development in the <i>Görgülü</i> case after the ECtHR judgment	26
1.4.2.4	Extension of the range of constitutional complaints in cases of non-compliance with an ECtHR judgment by German courts	27
1.4.2.5	The <i>Bundesverfassungsgericht</i> 's reservations against the binding effects of ECtHR judgments within the German domestic legal order: <i>Berücksichtigen</i> instead of <i>beachten</i>	28
1.4.2.6	The <i>Bundesverfassungsgericht</i> 's emphasis on the German legal order's <i>Völkerrechtsfreundlichkeit</i> and simultaneous failure to consistently construe this principle	31
1.4.2.6.1	The German legal order's sensitivity to obligations under public international law	31
1.4.2.6.2	<i>Völkerrechtsfreundlichkeit</i> and its consequences for the interpretation of German law	32
1.4.2.6.3	<i>Völkerrechtsfreundlichkeit</i> and the interpretation of constitutional law	33
1.4.2.6.4	Consequences of the German constitution's receptivity for public international law and a move away from the <i>Görgülü</i> decision's scepticism by the <i>Bundesverfassungsgericht</i> 's First Senate	34
1.4.2.6.5	The Convention's influence on the interpretation of German constitutional law in the context of <i>mittelbare Drittwirkung</i> , as exemplified by the <i>Caroline von Monaco III</i> case	37
1.5	Looking ahead	41
 Chapter 2: The European Court of Human Rights' <i>Caroline von Hannover</i> judgment and its reverberations		42
2.1	The Case of <i>Caroline von Hannover</i>	42

2.1.1	A sketch of the facts	42
2.1.2	Proceedings before the German civil courts	43
2.2	<i>Excursus</i> on the general personality right	47
2.2.1	The development of the general personality right by the civil courts	48
2.2.1.1	The changing constitutional background of the <i>Bürgerliches Gesetzbuch</i>	48
2.2.1.2	The initial interpretation of constitutionally guaranteed basic rights as law immediately binding private parties – <i>unmittelbare Drittwirkung</i>	50
2.2.1.3	The <i>Bundesgerichtshof</i> 's move away from <i>unmittelbare Drittwirkung</i>	52
2.2.2	The <i>Bundesverfassungsgericht</i> 's re-interpretation of the <i>Bundesgerichtshof</i> 's case-law: The <i>allgemeines Persönlichkeitsrecht</i> as a right existing under private law	53
2.2.3	The terminological confusion caused by the <i>Bundesverfassungsgericht</i> in its <i>Eppler</i> judgment of 1980	56
2.2.4	The strict distinction between the ' <i>zivilrechtliches allgemeines Persönlichkeitsrecht</i> ' and the ' <i>verfassungsrechtliches Persönlichkeitsrecht</i> '	57
2.3	The Case of <i>Caroline von Hannover</i> – continued	60
2.3.1	The constitutional law situation in the abstract	60
2.3.1.1	Autonomy as to one's image as an aspect of the personality right	61
2.3.1.2	Protection of the private sphere as a further aspect of the personality right	61
2.3.1.2.1	Private matters	61
2.3.1.2.2	Spaces of privacy	62
2.3.1.2.3	Celebrities and politicians not excluded from privacy protection	62
2.3.1.2.4	Private spheres outside the home	62
2.3.1.2.5	Privacy and commercialisation	63
2.3.1.2.6	Reinforcement of privacy protection for parents	64
2.3.2	Preparing the special ground for assessing the civil court judgments	65
2.3.2.1	The Constitutionality of secs. 22, 23 KUG	65
2.3.2.2	The scope of constitutional review: No predetermination of civil court decisions by constitutional law	65
2.3.2.3	Balancing the personality right and freedom of the press	66
2.3.3	Rejecting the constitutional complaint as unfounded in all but one point	67

2.4	The ECtHR's judgment in the <i>Caroline von Hannover</i> case	69
2.4.1	The ECtHR's approach to the case	69
2.4.1.1	The broad understanding of 'private life'	69
2.4.1.2	A closer look at the case-law referred to by the Court	71
2.4.1.2.1	The case of <i>Halford v. the United Kingdom</i>	71
2.4.1.2.2	Other cases of interferences with 'private life' in public contexts	71
2.4.1.3	Interferences with privacy by private entities under the law of the Convention	73
2.4.1.3.1	Positive obligations	73
2.4.1.3.2	Balancing the conflicting rights and interests	74
2.4.2	Application of the ECHR standards to the case	75
2.4.2.1	The different weighing of the competing positions by the ECtHR	75
2.4.2.1.1	Less (or even no?) weight of freedom of expression outside a debate of general interest	75
2.4.2.1.2	Is Strasbourg's approach to freedom of the press principally different from Karlsruhe's?	77
2.4.2.2	Evaluation of the German courts' application of secs. 22, 23 KUG	79
2.4.3	Does the ECtHR overstep the limits of its competence in demanding national courts to interpret domestic law in conformity with the Convention?	80
2.5	Reactions of the German <i>Bundesgerichtshof</i>	82
2.5.1	The <i>Bundesgerichtshof</i> 's judgment of 6 March 2007 in yet another <i>Princess Caroline</i> case	83
2.5.1.1	The new scheme of variable protection (' <i>abgestuftes Schutzkonzept</i> ') under secs. 22, 23 KUG	83
2.5.1.2	Applying the new scheme	86
2.5.1.3	Confirmation in two parallel cases	87
2.5.2	The <i>Bundesverfassungsgericht</i> 's decision in the <i>Caroline von Monaco III</i> case	87
2.5.2.1	The inter-relatedness of German constitutional law and the ECHR	88
2.5.2.2	The constitutionality of the new scheme of variable protection under secs. 22, 23 KUG	89
2.5.2.3	The <i>Bundesverfassungsgericht</i> 's evaluation of the application of the scheme by the civil courts	90

2.5.2.4	The <i>Bundesverfassungsgericht</i> 's careful attention to the Convention guarantees as construed by the ECtHR	90
2.5.3	The <i>Bundesgerichtshof</i> 's adherence to the new scheme of variable protection	93
2.6	The impact of the ECtHR's expansive reading of 'private life' (Article 8 ECHR) on the British courts: The <i>Campbell v. MGN Ltd</i> case	93
2.6.1	The facts of the case	94
2.6.2	Breach of confidence as a tort	95
2.6.3	The turning point of the case	96
2.6.4	The dissenters' position	97
2.6.5	The majority's point(s) of view	98
2.6.6	The core problem of balancing privacy and freedom of the press	101
2.6.7	How do the Convention rights affect the balancing under the law of breach of confidence?	102
2.6.8	The structure of the Convention's impact on English law	106
 Chapter 3: <i>Drittwirkung</i> under the ECHR: Human rights obligation of state authorities and their influence on judicial decisions in private law disputes		
3.1	State responsibility for acts of private persons	111
3.2	A closer look at Article 1 ECHR and obvious categories of the Convention's substantive requirements	115
3.2.1	The duty not to interfere	115
3.2.2	The duty of States to adjust their legal rules so that the treatment of private persons and entities meets certain standards	116
3.2.3	Duties to enact 'enabling' legislation	116
3.2.4	Duties to regulate the behaviour of private individuals <i>inter se</i>	117
3.3	Expanding the category of duties to regulate the behaviour of private individuals <i>inter se</i> beyond what is obvious from the Convention's wording	119
3.3.1	The base-line argument for the Contracting States' positive obligations to secure the Convention's fundamental rights and freedoms in relations between private individuals	122
3.3.2	The <i>Velosa Barreto</i> case: Revealing two dimensions of positive obligations	125
3.4	Positive obligations and legislation	128
3.4.1	Group I: Shortcomings in promoting the realisation of Convention guarantees by legislation	128

3.4.2	Group II: Insufficient protection provided by legislation against private interferences	135
3.5	Failure of state authorities other than the legislature to fulfil positive obligations	142
3.5.1	Failure of administrative authorities to comply with positive obligations	142
3.5.2	Failure of courts of justice to comply with positive obligations	144
3.5.2.1	Cases outside the field of tort law	144
3.5.2.2	Cases within the field of tort law	146
3.6	The remaining uncertainty as to the relation of positive and negative obligations under the Convention in cases of controversies between private parties	150
 Chapter 4: <i>Drittwirkung</i> of constitutionally guaranteed basic rights in the German legal order		
4.1	Starting out with hypotheses	153
4.2	The German <i>Bundesverfassungsgericht</i> 's <i>Lüth</i> Case	155
4.2.1	The objective value system of constitutional rights as the reason for their radiating effect	156
4.2.2	The <i>Bundesverfassungsgericht</i> 's solution: 'The balancing of legal values'	158
4.2.3	The 'balancing of legal values' in the <i>Lüth</i> case	159
4.3	Analysis and critique of the <i>Bundesverfassungsgericht</i> 's thesis that basic rights radiate into private law as objective norms	162
4.3.1	Judgments by civil courts as interventions into basic rights of parties	162
4.3.2	The need for balancing	169
4.3.3	The interests and values in the other side of the judicial scales	170
4.3.4	Proportionality	175
4.3.5	Balancing defined as an act of deciding how far to restrict one party's constitutionally guaranteed freedom for the sake of protecting the other party's constitutionally guaranteed freedom	175
4.4	The <i>Bundesverfassungsgericht</i> 's <i>Commercial Agent</i> decision	176
4.4.1	The facts of the case	176
4.4.2	Confirmation and further explication of the re-constructive reading of the <i>Lüth</i> judgment	177
4.4.2.1	Civil court judgments as interferences with basic rights	177
4.4.2.2	Restrictive constitutional review of decisions by regular courts	178

4.4.2.3	The especially severe interference in the case of a prohibition of working in one's trade leads to stricter scrutiny	179
4.4.2.4	The Janus-headed nature of civil court judgments: Burdening one party for the sake of protecting the other	180
4.4.2.5	The law can assign the task of balancing basic rights to the civil court judges	182
4.4.2.6	The civil courts are bound by duties to protect basic rights (<i>grundrechtliche Schutzpflichten</i>)	184
4.4.2.7	Distinguishing the duty to protect and the duty to respect occupational liberty (Article 12(1) of the <i>Grundgesetz</i>) in the <i>Commercial Agent</i> case	186
4.5	Tracing duties to protect and duties to respect basic rights in cases concerning statutory norms regulating private-law relations	187
4.5.1	Statutory protection against unfair dismissals: The <i>Kleinbetriebsklausel I</i> case and the exceptionally sole relevance of protective duties (<i>Schutzpflichten</i>)	187
4.5.2	The legal father's right to know the paternity of his child: Restricting the child's informational autonomy for the protection of the father's personality right and the relevance of the principle of proportionality (<i>Verhältnismäßigkeit, Übermaßverbot</i>)	189
4.6	Proportionality and practical concord in judicial case-by-case decisions on conflicting basic rights of private parties	193
4.6.1	The <i>prima facie</i> relevance of proportionality when the courts are called upon to solve a basic rights conflict	193
4.6.2	The exclusion of the principle of proportionality as a standard for the constitutional review of civil-court judgments in the <i>Bundesverfassungsgericht's Mephisto</i> case	194
4.6.3	Practical concord – <i>praktische Konkordanz</i>	199
4.6.4	A tendency towards further relevance of proportionality in the context of <i>Drittwirkung</i>	210
4.6.4.1	The <i>Caroline von Monaco I</i> case	210
4.6.4.2	The <i>Esra</i> case: Recognition of proportionality as an element in balancing competing rights	213
4.7	Empowering the judges to decide on basic rights conflicts within private-law controversies	218
4.8	Summing up	225

Chapter 5: Conclusions	226
5.1 Applicability of the principle of practical concord to cases under the Convention	226
5.1.1 The example of <i>Karhuvaara and Iltalehti</i>	226
5.1.2 Operating the principle of practical concord under the Convention using the two-variable test	229
5.1.2.1 Rationalisation of the balancing test	229
5.1.2.2 The two-variables test as a dynamic instrument	230
5.1.2.3 Practical concord can mean that one right might completely yield to another right in a specific case	231
5.1.2.4 No more than a restatement of judicial intuition?	231
5.1.2.5 The potential for acknowledging a certain degree of autonomy of domestic courts when they decide private controversies with implications for Convention guarantees	233
5.1.3 Have we got it all wrong?	237
5.2 Outlook	240
 <i>Addendum</i>	245
<i>Bibliography</i>	255
<i>Index</i>	263

European Court of Human Rights

- *A v. Norway*, no. 28070/06, judgment of 9 April 2009 **150**
- *A. v. the United Kingdom*, no. 25599/94, judgment of 23 September 1998, Reports of Judgments and Decisions 1998 VI **120–23**
- *Airey v. Ireland*, no. 6289/73, judgment of 9 October 1979, Series A no. 32 **122, 125, 129**
- *Artico v. Italy*, no. 6694/74, judgment of 13 May 1980, Series A no. 37 **82**
- *B. v. France*, no. 13343/87, judgment of 25 March 1992, Series A no. 232–C **125**
- *Bączkowski and Others v. Poland*, no. 1543/06, judgment of 3 May 2007, Reports of Judgments and Decisions 2007–VI **124**
- *Balçık and Others v. Turkey*, no. 25/02, judgment of 29 November 2007 **124**
- *Belvedere Alberghiera S.r.l v. Italy*, no. 31524/96, judgment of 30 May 2000, Reports of Judgments and Decisions 2000–VI **14**
- *Bennich-Zalewski v. Poland*, no. 59857/00, judgment of 22 April 2008 **122**
- *Bergens Tidende and Others v. Norway*, no. 26132/95, judgment of 2 May 2000, Reports of Judgments and Decisions 2000–IV **78**
- *Bladet Tromsø and Stensaas v. Norway* [GC], no. 21980/93, judgment of 20 May 1999, Reports of Judgments and Decisions 1999 III **74, 102, 152**
- *Botta v. Italy*, no. 21439/93, judgment of 24 February 1998, Reports of Judgments and Decisions 1998 I 70 **143–44**
- *Broniowski v. Poland* [GC], no. 31443/96, judgment of 22 June 2004, Reports of Judgments and Decisions 2004–V **124**
- *Budayeva and Others v. Russia*, nos. 15339/02, 21166/02, 20058/02, 11673/02 and 15343/02, judgment of 20 March 2008 **117, 121, 128, 142**
- *Burghartz v. Switzerland*, no. 16213/90, judgment of 22 February 1994, Series A no. 280 B **70**
- *Calvelli and Ciglio v. Italy* [GC], no. 32967/96, judgment of 17 January 2002, Reports of Judgments and Decisions 2002–I **117–18, 121**

- *Christine Goodwin v. the United Kingdom* [GC], no. 28957/95, judgment of 11 July 2002, Reports of Judgments and Decisions 2002–VI 116, 241
- *Cossey v. the United Kingdom*, no. 10843/84, judgment of 27 September 1990, Series A no. 184 131
- *Costello-Roberts v. the United Kingdom*, no. 13134/87, judgment of 25 March 1993, Series A no. 247–C 111–13, 115, 122–23
- *De Diego Nafría v. Spain*, no. 46833/99, judgment of 14 March 2002 236
- *De Wilde, Ooms and Versyp v. Belgium*, no. 2832/66, 2835/66, 2899/66, judgment of 18 June 1971, Series A no. 12 17
- *Dickson v. The United Kingdom* [GC], no. 44362/04, judgment of 4 December 2007, Reports of Judgments and Decisions 2007–XIII 92
- *Draon v. France* [GC], no. 1513/03, judgment of 6 October 2005 124
- *Dudgeon v. the United Kingdom*, no. 7525/76, judgment of 22 October 1981, Series A no. 45 101
- *Éditions Plon v. France*, no. 58148/00, judgment of 18 May 2004, Reports of Judgments and Decisions 2004–IV 75
- *Emonet and Others v. Switzerland*, no. 39051/03, judgment of 13 December 2007, Reports of Judgments and Decisions 2007–XIV 124
- *Friedl v. Austria*, no. 15225/89, judgment of 31 January 1995, Series A no. 305 B 71–2
- *Genovese et al. v. Italy*, no. 9119/03, judgment of 2 February 2006 14
- *Glass v. the United Kingdom*, no. 61827/00, judgment of 9 March 2004, Reports of Judgments and Decisions 2004–II 241
- *Goodwin v. the United Kingdom*, no. 17488/90, judgment of 27 March 1996, Reports of Judgments and Decisions 1996–II 101
- *Görgülü v. Germany*, no. 74969/01, judgment of 26 February 2004 25–35
- *Guerra and Others v. Italy*, no. 14967/89, judgment of 19 February 1998, Reports of Judgments and Decisions 1998–I 142–43
- *Gurguenidze v. Georgia*, no. 71678/01, judgment of 17 October 2006 150
- *H.L. v. the United Kingdom*, no. 45508/99, judgment of 5 October 2004, Reports of Judgments and Decisions 2004–IX 17
- *H.L.R. v. France*, no. 24573/94, judgment of 29 April 1997, Reports of Judgments and Decisions 1997–III 121
- *Halford v. the United Kingdom*, no. 20605/92, judgment of 25 June 1997, Reports of Judgments and Decisions 1997 III 71, 77
- *Handyside v. the United Kingdom*, no. 5493/72, judgment of 7 December 1976, Series A no. 24 74
- *I v. Finland*, no. 20511/03, judgment of 17 July 2008 143, 149
- *I. v. United Kingdom* [GC], no. 25680/94, judgment of 11. July 2002 116, 241

- *Iglesias Gil and A.U.I. v. Spain*, no. 56673/00, judgment of 29 April 2003, Reports of Judgments and Decisions 2003–V 235
- *Ilaşcu and Others v. Moldova and Russia* [GC], no. 48787/99, judgment of 8 July 2004, Reports of Judgments and Decisions 2004–VII 123
- *İlhan v. Turkey* [GC], no. 22277/93, decision of 27 June 2000, § 91, Reports of Judgments and Decisions 2000–VII 118
- *Immobiliare Cerro s.a.s. v. Italy*, no. 35638/03, judgment of 23 February 2006 14
- *Independent News and Media and Independent Newspapers Ireland Limited v. Ireland*, no. 55120/00, judgment of 16 June 2005, Reports of Judgments and Decisions 2005–V (extracts) 153
- *J.A. Pye (Oxford) Ltd and J.A. Pye (Oxford) Land Ltd v. the United Kingdom* [GC], no. 44302/02, judgment of 30 August 2007 15
- *James and Others v. the United Kingdom*, no. 8793/79, judgment of 21 February 1986, Series A no. 98 131
- *Jersild v. Denmark*, no. 15890/89, judgment of 23 September 1994, Series A no. 298 109
- *Karhuvaara and Iltalehti v. Finland*, no. 53678/00, judgment of 16 November 2004, Reports of Judgments and Decisions 2004–X 150–52, 78, 92, 226–35
- *Keegan v. Ireland*, no. 16969/90, judgment of 26 May 1994, Series A no. 290 125, 130, 133–34, 150
- *Keenan v. United Kingdom*, no. 27229/95, judgment of 3 April 2001, Reports of Judgments and Decisions 2001–III 117–18
- *Kılıç v. Turkey*, no. 22492/93, decision of 20 March 2000, Reports of Judgments and Decisions 2000–III 118
- *Krone Verlag GmbH & Co. KG v. Austria* (no. 2), no. 40284/98, judgment of 6 November 2003 78
- *Krone Verlag GmbH & Co. KG v. Austria*, no. 34315/96, judgment of 26 February 2002 153
- *Kroon and Others v. the Netherlands*, no. 18535/91, judgment of 27 October 1994, §§ 28–40, Series A no. 297–C 130
- *Kutzner v. Germany*, no. 46544/99, judgment of 26 February 2002, Reports of Judgments and Decisions 2002–I 124
- *L.C.B. v. the United Kingdom*, no. 23413/94, judgment of 9 June 1998, Reports 1998–III 117
- *Lindon and Others v. France* [GC], no. 21279/02, judgment of 22 October 2007 92
- *López Ostra v. Spain*, no. 16798/90, judgment of 9 December 1994, A no. 303–C 121, 142–43
- *Mahmut Kaya v. Turkey*, no. 22535/93, decision of 28 March 2000, Reports of Judgments and Decisions 2000–III 118
- *Marckx v. Belgium*, no. 6833/74, judgment of 13 June 1979, Series A no. 31 128–31, 135–39, 146

- *Matthews v. the United Kingdom* [GC], no. 24833/94, judgment of 28 February 1999, Reports of Judgments and Decisions 1999–I 113
- *Maurice v. France*, no. 11810/03, judgment of 6 October 2005, Reports of Judgments and Decisions 2005–IX 124
- *Mazurek v. France*, no. 34406/97, judgment of 01 February 2000, Reports of Judgments and Decisions 2000–II 146
- *Mikulić v. Croatia*, no. 53176/99, judgment of 7 February 2002, Reports of Judgments and Decisions 2002–I 124–25, 132, 150
- *Minelli v. Switzerland*, no. 14991/02, decision of 14 June 2005 91–2
- *News Verlags GmbH & CoKG v. Austria*, no. 31457/96, judgment of 11 January 2000, Reports of Judgments and Decisions 2000 I 153
- *Nielsen v. Denmark*, no. 10929/84, judgment of 18 November 1988, Series A no. 144 123
- *Niemietz v. Germany*, no. 13710/88, judgment of 16 December 1992, Series A no. 251–B 70
- *Nitecki v. Poland*, no. 65653/01, decision of 21 March 2002 242
- *Nuutinen v. Finland*, no. 32842/96, judgment of 27 June 2000, Reports of Judgments and Decisions 2000–VIII 124
- *Observer and Guardian v. the United Kingdom*, no. 13585/88, judgment of 26 November 1991, Series A no. 216 74, 76, 102
- *Odièvre v. France* [GC], no. 42326/98, judgment of 13 February 2003, Reports of Judgments and Decisions 2003–III 124–25, 131–34, 242
- *Öneryıldız v. Turkey* [GC], no. 48939/99, judgment of 30 November 2004, Reports of Judgments and Decisions 2004–XII 117, 121, 142
- *Öneryıldız v. Turkey*, no. 48939/99, judgment of 18 June 2002 124
- *Osman v. United Kingdom*, no. 23452/94, judgment of 28 Oct. 1998, Reports 1998–VIII 117–21, 142
- *Otto-Preminger-Institut v. Austria*, no. 13470/87, judgment of 20 September 1994, Series A no. 295–A 123
- *Ouranio Toxo v. Greece*, no. 74989/01, judgment of 20 October 2005, Report of Judgments and Decisions 2005–X (extracts) 124
- *Özgür Gündem ./. Türkiye*, no. 23144/93, judgment of 16 March 2000, Reports of Judgments and Decisions 2000–III 78, 123
- *P.G. and J.H. v. the United Kingdom*, no. 44787/98, Reports of Judgments and Decisions 2001 IX 70–2
- *Padovani v. Italy*, no. 13396/87, judgment of 26 February 1993, Series A no. 257–B 235
- *Peck v. the United Kingdom*, no. 44647/98, judgment of 28 January 2003, Reports of Judgments and Decisions 2003 I 70–2
- *Pedersen and Baadsgaard v. Denmark* [GC], no. 49017/99, judgment of 17 December 2004 93
- *Pentiacova and Others v. Moldova*, no. 14462/03, decision of 4 January 2005, Reports of Judgments and Decisions 2005–I 242
- *Pérez de Rada Cavanilles v. Spain*, no. 28090/95, judgment of 28 October 1998, Reports 1998–VIII 235

- *Pfeifer v. Austria*, no. 12556/03, judgment of 15 November 2007 150, 153
- *Pla and Puncernau v. Andorra*, no. 69498/01, judgment of 13 July 2004, Reports of Judgments and Decisions 2004–VIII 145–46, 235–38
- *Platakou v. Greece*, no. 38460/97, judgment of 11 January 2001, Reports of Judgments and Decisions 2001–I 81
- *Plattform ‘Ärzte für das Leben’ v. Austria*, no. 10126/82, judgment of 21 June 1988, Series A no. 139 123
- *Powell and Rayner v. the United Kingdom*, no. 9310/81, judgment of 21 February 1990, Series A no. 172 124
- *Prager and Oberschlick v. Austria*, no. 15974/90, judgment of 26 April 1995, Series A no. 313 153
- *Prenna et al. v. Italy*, no. 69907/01, judgment of 9 February 2006 14
- *Pretty v. the United Kingdom*, no. 2346/02, judgment of 29 April 2002, Reports of Judgments and Decisions 2002–III 241
- *Prisma Press v. France*, nos. 66910/01 and 71612/01, decision of 1 July 2003 75
- *Rantsev v. Cyprus and Russia*, no. 25965/04, judgment of 7 January 2010 118
- *Raimondo v. Italy*, no. 12954/87, judgment of 22 February 1994, Series A no. 281–A 124
- *Rees v. the United Kingdom*, no. 9532/81, judgment of 17 October 1986, Series A no. 106 131
- *Rosenzweig and Bonded Warehouses LTD. v. Poland*, no. 51728/99, judgment of 28 July 2005 124
- *Schüssel v. Austria*, no. 42409/98, decision of 21 February 2002 141
- *Sciarrotta et al. v. Italy*, no. 14793/02, judgment of 12 January 2006 13–15
- *Scozzari and Giunta v. Italy* [GC], nos. 39221/98 and 41963/98, Reports of Judgments and Decisions 2000–VIII 26
- *Seguin v. France*, no. 42400/98, decision of 7 March 2000 119
- *Sentges v. the Netherlands*, no. 27677/02, decision of 8 July 2003 241
- *Sibson v. the United Kingdom*, no. 14327/88, judgment of 20 April 1993, Series A no. 258–A 136
- *Siliadin v. France*, no. 73316/01, judgment of 26 July 2005, Reports of Judgments and Decisions 2005–VII 118–20
- *Slivenko v. Latvia* [GC], no. 48321/99, judgment of 9 October 2003, Reports of Judgments and Decisions 2003–X 235
- *Sovtransavto Holding v Ukraine.*, no. 48553/99, judgment of 25 July 2002, Reports of Judgments and Decisions 2002–VII 124
- *Sporrong and Lönnroth v. Sweden*, no. 7151/75 and 7152/75, judgment of 23 September 1982, Series A no. 52 131
- *Stjerna v. Finland*, no. 18131/91, judgment of 25 November 1994, Series A no. 299–B 227
- *Storck v. Germany*, no. 61603/00, judgment of 16 June 2005, Reports of

- Judgments and Decisions 2005–V 16–20, 81–2, 112, 122–23, 147–49, 152
- *Stubbings and Others v. the United Kingdom*, nos. 22083/93, 22095/93, judgment of 22 October 1996, Reports of Judgments and Decisions 1996–IV 120–21
 - *Sychev v. Ukraine*, no. 4773/02, judgment of 11 October 2005 114–15
 - *Tammer v. Estonia*, no. 41205/98, Reports of Judgments and Decisions 2001 I. 109
 - *Thoma v. Luxembourg*, no. 38432/97, judgment of 29 March 2001, Reports of Judgments and Decisions 2001–III 78
 - *Tønsbergs Blad and Others v. Norway*, no. 510/04, judgment of 1 March 2007 91–2
 - *Toth v. Austria*, no. 11894/85, judgment of 12 December 1991, Series A no. 224 18
 - *Tysiąg v. Poland*, no. 5410/03, judgment of 20 March 2007 133, 149, 241–42
 - *Uçar v. Turkey*, no. 52392/99, judgment of 11 April 2006 134–35
 - *United Communist Party of Turkey and Others v. Turkey*, no. 19392/92, judgment of 30 January 1998, Reports 1998–I 115
 - *Van der Mussele v. Belgium*, no. 8919/80, judgment of 23 November 1983, Series A 70 112, 118
 - *van Küick v. Germany*, no. 35968/97, judgment of 12 June 2003, Reports of Judgments and Decisions 2003–VII 144, 150, 241
 - *Velosa Barreto v. Portugal*, no. 18072/91, judgment of 21 November 1995, Series A no. 334 125–27
 - *Verein gegen Tierfabriken v. Switzerland*, no. 24699/94, judgment of 28 June 2001, Reports of Judgments and Decisions 2001–VI 123, 125, 138–40
 - *Verlagsgruppe News GmbH (No. 2)*, no. 10520/02, judgment of 14 December 2006 92
 - *Verliere v. Switzerland*, no. 41953/98, decision of 28 June 2001, Reports of Judgments and Decisions 2001 VII 122
 - *Vermeire v. Belgium*, no. 12849/87, judgment of 29 November 1991, Series A no. 214–C 146
 - *Von Hannover v. Germany*, no. 59320/00, judgment of 24 June 2004, Reports of Judgments and Decisions 2004–VI 2, 41, 42–7, 69–77, 79–80, 92, 110, 144–53
 - *Von Hannover v. Germany*, no. 59320/00, judgment of 28 July 2005 227–38
 - *White v. Sweden*, no. 42435/02, judgment of 19 September 2006 150
 - *Wilson & the National Union of Journalists and Others v. the United Kingdom*, no. 30668/96, 30671/96 and 30678/96, judgment of 2 July 2002, Reports of Judgments and Decisions 2002–V 123
 - *Winterwerp v. the Netherlands*, no. 6301/73, judgment of 24 October 1979, Series A no. 33 235

- *Wirtschafts-Trend-Zeitschriften-Verlagsgesellschaft mbH v. Austria*, no. 66298/01 et al., judgment of 13 December 2005 92
- *Wos v. Poland*, no. 22860/02, decision of 1 March 2005, Reports of Judgments and Decisions 2005–IV 112–13
- *X and Y v. the Netherlands*, no. 8978/80, judgment of 26 March 1985, Series A no. 91 120–25, 140–41, 146
- *X, Y and Z v. the United Kingdom*, no. 21830/93, judgment of 22 April 1997, Reports 1997–II 130, 150
- *Young, James and Webster v. The United Kingdom*, nos. 7601/76, 7806/77, judgment of 13 August 1981, Series A no. 44, 114–15, 135–140
- *Z and Others v. the United Kingdom* [GC], no. 29392/95, judgment of 10 May 2001, Reports of Judgments and Decisions 2001–V 115, 123
- *Z. v. Finland*, no. 22009/93, judgment of 25 January 1996, Reports 1997–I 100, 109

European Commission of Human Rights

- *De Geillustreerde Pers N.V. v. the Netherlands*, no. 5178/71, decision of 12 October 1973, Decisions and Reports 8, 5 123
- *Ensslin, Baader and Raspe v. Germany*, no. 7572/76, decision of 8 July 1978, Decisions and Reports 14, 64 124
- *Friedl v. Austria*, no. 15225/89, Report of the Commission of 19 May 1994 71–2
- *M. v. the United Kingdom and Ireland*, no. 9837/82, decision of 4 March 1985, Decisions and Reports 47, 27 117
- *Guy Jaspers v. Belgium*, no. 8403/78, decision of 29 September 1982, Decisions and Reports 22, 100 124
- *H. v. the United Kingdom and Ireland*, no. 9833/82, decision of 7 March 1985, Decisions and Reports 42, 53 18
- *K. v. Ireland*, no. 10416/83, decision of 17 May 1984, Decisions and Reports 38, 158 18
- *Lavissee v. France*, no. 14223/88, decision of 5 June 1991, Decisions and Reports 70, 218 117
- *Lupker and Others v. the Netherlands*, no. 18395/91, decision of 7 December 1992 72
- *Rommelfanger v. the Federal Republic of Germany*, no. 12242/86, decision of 6 September 1989, Decisions and Reports 62, 151 72, 123
- *Tugar v. Italy*, no. 22869/93, decision of 18 October 1995, Decision and Reports 83–A, 26 117
- *X v. Germany*, no. 2413/65, decision of 16 December 1966, Collection 23, 1 124
- *X v. the United Kingdom*, no. 8160/78, decision of 12 March 1981, Decision and Reports 22, 27 123

- *Konttinen v. Finland*, no. 24949/94, decision of 3 December 1996, Decision and Reports 87, 68 123
- *Mrs. W. v. Ireland*, no. 9360/81, decision of 28 February 1983, Decision and Reports 32, 211 117
- *Mrs. v. the United Kingdom*, no. 9348/81, judgment of 28 February 1983, Decision and Reports 32, 190 117
- *X v. Ireland*, no. 6040/73, decision of 20 July 1973, Yearbook 16 (1973), 388 117
- *K v. the United Kingdom and Ireland*, no. 9839/82, decision of 7 March 1985 117

European Court of Justice:

- *Internationale Handelsgesellschaft v. Einfuhr und Vorratsstelle für Getreide und Futtermilch*, judgment of 17 December 1970, case 11/70, (1970) European Court Reports 1125 9–10
- *Liselotte Hauer v. Land Rheinland-Pfalz*, judgment of 13 December 1979, case 44/79, (1979) European Court Reports 3727 9–10
- *Nold v. European Commission*, case 4/73, judgment of 14 May 1974, (1974) European Court Reports 491 10

German Federal Constitutional Court (*Bundesverfassungsgericht*):

- Decision of 26 April 2001 – 1 BvR 758/97–, 2001 Neue Juristische Wochenschrift 1921 84
- Judgment of 20 October 1954 – 1 BvR 527/52–, BVerfGE 4, 52 56
- Judgment of 26 March 1957 – 2 BvR 1/55 –, BVerfGE 6, 309 32, 56
- Judgment of 15 Jan. 1958 – 1 BvR 400/51 (*Lüth*), BVerfGE 7, 198 56–7, 154–223
- Decision of 14 January 1960 BVerfGE 10, 271 [274] – 2 BvR 243/60 27
- Judgment of 11 June 1958 – 1 BvR 596/56 (*Apotheken-Urteil*), BVerfGE 7, 377 167, 179
- Decision of 7 April 1964 – 1 BvL 12/63 (*lift-arranging agency*), BVerfGE 17, 306 (313) 192
- Decision of 7 April 1964 – 1 BvL 12/63 (*falconer licence*), BVerfGE 55, 159 (165) 192
- Decision of 10 June 1964 – 1 BvR 37/63 – BVerfGE 18, 85 55, 65, 178
- Decision of 30 June 1964 – 1 BvR 93/64 – BVerfGE 18, 112 32
- Decision of 15 December 1965 – 1 BvR 513/65 (*Wencker*), BVerfGE 19, 342 (348–349) 192
- Decision of 24 February 1971 – 1 BvR 435/68 (*Mephisto*), BVerfGE 30, 173 55–6, 195, 208–09
- Decision of 4 May 1971 – 1 BvR 636/68, BVerfGE 31, 58 32, 194–208, 213–19

- Judgment of 6 December 1972 – 1 BvR 230/70 and 95/71 (*Förderstufe*), BVerfGE 34, 165 (192–193) 219
- Decision of 31 January 1973 – 2 BvR 454/71 (*tape-recording*), BVerfGE 34, 238 47, 56, 61
- Decision of 14 February 1973 – 1 BvR 112/65 (*Soraya*), BVerfGE 34, 269 48–55, 243
- Decision of 14 March 1973 – 2 BvR 621/72, 2 BvR 622/72, 2 BvR 635/72, 2 BvR 912/72 – BVerfGE 34, 384–404 [395] 27
- Judgment of 5 June 1973 – 1 BvR 536/72 (*Lebach*), BVerfGE 35, 202–245 57
- Decision of 17 December 1975 – 1 BvR 63/68–, BVerfGE 41, 29 202
- Decision of 17 December 1975 – 1 BvR 428/69–, BVerfGE 41, 65 202
- 17 December 1975 – 1 BvR 548/68–, BVerfGE 41, 88 202
- Decision of 27 January 1976 – 1 BvR 2325/73–, BVerfGE 41, 251 219
- Decision of 11 May 1976 – 1 BvR 671/70–, BVerfGE 42, 143 222
- Decision of 13 January 1976 – 1 BvR 631/69, 1 BvR 24/70 – BVerfGE 41, 126 [149] 27
- Decision of 22 June 1977 – 1 BvR 799/76 (*Oberstufenreform*), BVerfGE 45, 400 219
- Judgment of 16 October 1977 – 1 BvQ 5/77 (*Schleyer*), BVerfGE 46, 160 185
- Decision of 21 December 1977 – 1 BvL 1/75, 1 BvR 147/75 (*sex education*), BVerfGE 47, 46 219
- Decision of 8 August 1978 – 2 BvL 8/77 (*Kalkar I*), BVerfGE 49, 89 219, 233
- Decision of 25 July 1979 – 2 BvL 6/77 (*‘Vielleicht’ decision*), BVerfGE 52, 187 24
- Decision of 25 July 1979 – 2 BvR 878/74, BVerfGE 52, 131 56
- Decision of 16 October 1979 – 1 BvR 647/70 und 7/74 (*school prayer*), BVerfGE 52, 223 202
- Decision of 20 December 1979 (57) – (*Mülheim-Kärlich*), 1 BvR 385/77, BVerfGE 53, 30 185
- Decision of 3 June 1980 – 1 BvR 185/77 (*Eppler*), BVerfGE 54, 148 (153) 57
- Decision of 14 January 1981 – 1 BvR 612/72 (*Fluglärm (air-traffic noise)*), BVerfGE 56, 54 185
- Decision of 23 June 1981 – 2 BvR 1107, 1124/77 and 195/79, BVerfGE 58, 1 32
- Decision of 10 November 1981 – 2 BvR 1058/79 (*Eurocontrol II*), BVerfGE 59, 63 (90) 24
- Decision of 13 January 1982 – 1 BvR 848, 1047/77, 916, 1307/78, 350/79, 475, 902, 965, 1177, 1238, 1461/80 ?, BVerfGE 59, 231 202
- Judgment of 9 February 1982 – 1 BvR 845/79?, BVerfGE 59, 360 202
- Decision of 22 March 1983 – 2 BvR 457/78, BVerfGE 63, 343 32
- Decision of 17 May 1983 – 2 BvR 731/80 – BVerfGE 64, 135 27

- Decision of 16 December 1983 – 2 BvR 1160, 1565, 1714/83 (*Nachrüstung (new arms deployment)*), BVerfGE 66, 39 185
- Decision of 22 October 1986 – 2 BvR 197/83 (*Solange II*), BVerfGE 73, 339 – 388 (375) 24 BVerfGE 74, 102 (128) 13 January 1987 27
- Decision of 26 March 1987 – 2 BvR 589/79 (*presumption of innocence*), 740/81 und 284/85–, BVerfGE 74, 358 (370) 24, 32–4
- Decision of 31 March 1987 – 2 BvM 2/86, BVerfGE 75, 1 32
- Decision of 8 April 1987 – 2 BvR 687/85 (*Kloppenburg*), BVerfGE 75, 223 (244) 24
- Judgment of 8 April 1987 – 1 BvL 8, 16/84–, BVerfGE 75, 64 184
- Decision of 29 October 1987 – 2 BvR 624, 1080, 2029/83 (*chemical weapons depots*), BVerfGE 77, 170 24, 219
- Decision of 3 November 1987 – 1 BvR 1257/84, 861/85 (*Herrnburger Report*), BVerfGE 77, 240 208–09
- Judgment of 14 July 1988 – 1 BvR 1640/97 (*spelling reform*), BVerfGE 98, 218 219
- Judgment of 7 Feb. 1990 – 1 BvR 26/841 (*commercial agent*), BVerfGE 81, 242 176–205
- Decision of 29 May 1990 – 2 BvR 254, 1343/88, BVerfGE 82, 106 (120) 34
- Decision of 14 November 1990 – 2 BvR 1462/87, BVerfGE 83, 119 (128) 34
- Decision of 27 November 1990 – 1 BvR 402/87 (*Mutzenbacher*), BVerfGE 83, 130 (143), 208–09, 219, 233–34
- Judgment of 28 January 1992 – 1 BvR 1025/82, 1 BvL 16/83 and 10/91 (*prohibition of night work*), BVerfGE 85, 191 24
- Decision of 25 March 1992 – 1 BvR 1430/88 (*telephone trap*), BVerfGE 85, 386, 219
- Decision of 7 March 1993 – 1 BvR 1215/87 (*national anthem*), BVerfGE 81, 298 203
- Judgment of 28 May 1993 – 2 BvF 2/90 und 4, 5/92 (*abortion II*), BVerfGE 88, 203 242
- Judgment of 12 October 1993 – 2 BvR 2134, 2159/92 (*Maastricht*), BVerfGE 89, 155 (190) 24
- Decision of 19 Oct. 1993 – 1 BvR 567, 1044/89, BVerfGE 89, 214 (229–234), 199–202
- Judgment of 12 July 1994 – 2 BvE 3/92, 5/93, 7/93, 8/93 (*Out-of-area missions*), BVerfGE 90, 286 (364) 24
- Decision of 16 May 1995 – 1 BvR 1087/91, BVerfGE 93, 1 203
- Decision of 12 November 1997 – 1 BvR 479/92 und 307/94 (*child as damage*), BVerfGE 96, 375 242
- Decision of 21 December 1997 – 2 BvL 6/95 (*continued validity of GDR criminal law*), BVerfGE 97, 117 (124) 24
- Decision of 14 January 1998 – 1 BvR 1861/93, 1864/96, 2073/97 (*Caroline von Monaco I*), BVerfGE 97, 125 43, 58, 210–213

- Decision of 27 January 1998 – 1 BvL 15/87 (*Kleinbetriebsklausel I*), BVerfGE 97, 169 188, 203
- Decision of 24 March 1998 – 1 BvR 131/96 – BVerfGE 97, 391 66, 174
- Judgment of 6 July 1999 – 2 BvF 3/90 (*regulation on chicken keeping*), BVerfGE 101, 1 219
- Judgment of 15 December 1999 – 1 BvR 653/96 (*Caroline von Monaco II*), BVerfGE 101, 361 2, 4–5, 234
- Decision of 31 July 2001 – 1 BvR 1174/01 p. 25
- Judgment of 24 September 2003 – 2 BvR 1436/02 (*headscarf*), BVerfGE 108, 282 233
- Judgment of 24 April 1985 – 2 BvF 2, 3, 4/83 und 2/84 (*conscientious objectors against military service*), BVerfGE 69, 1 192
- Decision of 14 October 2004 – 2 BvR 1481/04 (*Görgülü*), BVerfGE 111, 307 (315–316, 316–317) 24, 25–35, 30–2
- Judgment of 21 June 2005 – VI ZR 122/04, Neue Juristische Wochenzeitschrift 2005, 2844 – 2848 217
- Decision of 6 December 2005 – 1 BvR 1905/02, BVerfGE 115, 51 222
- Decision of 14 March 2006 – 1 BvR 2087, 2111/03 (*business and trade secrets*), BVerfGE 115, 205 203, 207
- Judgment of 25 February 1975 – 1 BvF 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6/74 (*abortion I*), BVerfGE 39, 1 242
- Decision of 23 May 2006 – 1 BvR 2530/04 (*insolvency administrator*), BVerfGE 116, 1 203, 207
- Decision of 13 June 2006 – 1 BvR 565/06–, 2006 Neue Juristische Wochenschrift 2835 84
- Decision of 21 August 2006 – 1 BvR 2606/04, 1 BvR, 2845/04, 1 BvR 2846/04, 1 BvR 2847/04–, 2006 Neue Juristische Wochenschrift 3406 = 2006 Europäische Grundrechtezeitschrift 599 5
- Decision of 22 August 2006 – 1 BvR 1168/04, 2006 Neue Juristische Wochenschrift 3409 58–9
- Judgment of 13 February 2007 – 1 BvR 421/05 (*paternity*), BVerfGE 117, 202 189
- Decision of 13 June 2007 – 1 BvR 1783/05 (*Esra*), BVerfGE 119, 1 213–23
- Decision of 30 January 2008 – 2 BvR 754/07, 2008 Neue Zeitschrift für Verwaltungsrecht 547 (549) 233
- Decision of 26 February 2008 – 1 BvR 1602, 1606, 1626/07 (*Caroline von Monaco III*), BVerfGE 120, 180 (218, 209–210) 28, 35–41, 83, 88–92, 241
- Decision of 26 February 2008 – 1 BvR 1602, 1606, 1626/07–, BVerfGE 120, 180 28, 59, 83
- Judgment of 27 February 2008 – 1 BvR 370, 595/07– BVerfGE 120, 274 1
- Decision 11 March 2008 – 1 BvR 256/08, BVerfGE 121, 1 1
- Decision of 15 October 2008 – 2 BvR 236, 237/08–, BVerfGE 122, 63 1

- Decision of 28 October 2008 – 1 BvR 256/08–, BVerfGE 122, 120 1
- Judgment of 15 December 1999 – I BvR 653/96 (*Caroline von Monaco II*), BVerfGE 101 361 60–9, 73, 77–8, 89

German Federal Court of Justice (*Bundesgerichtshof*):

- Judgment of 25 May 1954 – I ZR 211/53 (*Schacht*), 1954 Neue Juristische Wochenschrift 1404 = 1954 Juristenzeitung 698 = BGHZ 13, 334 4, 48–50
- Judgment of 10 May 1957 – I ZR 234/55–1957 Neue Juristische Wochenschrift 1315 = BGHZ 24, 200 (208) 45
- Judgment of 2 April 1957 – VI ZR 9/56–, 1957 Neue Juristische Wochenschrift 1146 = BGHZ 24, 72 49
- Judgment of 14 February 1958 – I ZR 151/56 (*Herrenreiter*), 1958 neue Juristische Wochenschrift 827 = 1958 Juristenzeitung 571 = BGHZ 26, 349 4, 50–2, 243
- Judgment of 19 September 1961 – VI ZR 259/60– (*Ginsengwurzel*), 1961 Neue Juristische Wochenschrift 2059 = BGHZ 35, 363 52–3, 243
- Judgment of 24 October 1961 – VI ZR 204/60–, 1962 Neue Juristische Wochenschrift 32 = BGHZ 36, 77 49
- Judgment of 10 November 1961 – I ZR 78/60 (*Hochzeitsbild*), GRUR 1962, 211 (212) 45
- Judgment of 5 January 1962 – VI ZR 72/61–, 1962 Neue Juristische Wochenschrift 1004 5
- Judgment of 9 June 1965 – I b ZR 126/63 (*Spielgefährtin*), 1965 Neue Juristische Wochenschrift 2148 45
- Judgment of 26 January 1965 – VI ZR 204/63 (*Gretna Gree*), 1965 Juristenzeitung 411 45
- Judgment of 15 November 1994 – VI ZR 56/94–1995 Neue Juristische Wochenschrift 861 = BGHZ 128, 1 243
- Judgment of 19 December 1995 – VI ZR 15/95–, 1996 Neue Juristische Wochenschrift 1128 = BGHZ 131, 332 2
- Judgment of 9 December 2003 – VI ZR 373/02–, 2004 Neue Juristische Wochenschrift 762 2
- Judgment of 19 October 2004 – VI ZR 292/03–, 2005 Neue Juristische Wochenschrift 594 5
- Judgment of 6 March 2007 – VI ZR 51/06–, 2007 Neue Juristische Wochenschrift 1977 = 2007 Europäische Grundrechtezeitschrift 499 44, 85–8
- Judgment of 19 June 2007 – VI ZR 12/06– (*Grönemeyer*), 2007 Neue Juristische Wochenschrift 3440 5
- Judgment of 3 July 2007 – VI ZR 164/06–, 2008 Neue Juristische Wochenschrift 749 4, 93
- Judgment of 24 June 2008 – VI ZR 156/06–, 2008 Neue Juristische Wochenschrift 3134 2

- Judgment of 1 July 2008 – VI ZR 243/06–, 2008 *Neue Juristische Wochenschrift*, 3138 2
- Judgment of 14 November 1995 – VI ZR 410/94 – 1996 *Neue Juristische Wochenschrift*, 593 – Bundeskanzler 45

German local courts (*Amtsgerichte*):

- *Amtsgericht Ahrensböck*, (*Reichspräsident Ebert and Reichswehrminister Noske*) judgment of 9 March 1920, 1920 *Deutsche Juristenzeitung* 596 45

German Courts of Appeal (*Landgerichte*):

- *Kammergericht Berlin*, , judgment of 12 October 1927 – 10 U 11325/27 (*Kaiser Wilhelm II*), 1928 *Juristische Wochenschrift* 363 45
- *Landgericht Bonn*, judgment of 4 June 1992 – 15 O 440/91, 1992 *Archiv für Presserecht* 386 6
- *Landgericht Trier*, judgment of 26 October 1995 – 6 O 57/95, 1995 *Entscheidungen in Kirchensachen* 434 6

German Higher Regional Courts (*Oberlandesgerichte*):

- *Oberlandesgericht München*, judgment of 6 December 1962 – 6 U 2160/61 (*Kanzlerkandidat*), 1964 *Archiv für Urheber- und Medienrecht* 322 45
- *Oberlandesgericht Hamburg*, judgment of 8 December 1994 – 3 U 64/94, 1995 *Neue Juristische Wochenschrift – Rechtsprechungsreport* 790–793 43–4
- *Oberlandesgericht Koblenz*, judgment of 20 December 1996 –10 U 1667/95, 1997 *Neue Juristische Wochenschrift* 1375 6
- *Oberlandesgericht Bremen*, judgment of 22 December 2000 –3 U 99/98, *JURIS* 18
- *Oberlandesgericht München*, judgment of 22 October 2003 –21 U 2540/03, 2004 *Neue Juristische Wochenschrift* 959 5
- *Oberlandesgericht Naumburg*, – 14. ZS – 3. FamS–, decision of 30 June 2004 – 14 WF 64/04, 2004 *Familienrechts-Zeitschrift (FamRZ)*, 1510 27

English Courts:

- *A v B plc*, [2003] QB 195, 105
- *A v B*, [2002] 2 All England Law Reports 545, 104–5
- *A v. B & C*, [2002] England and Wales Court of Appeal Civil Division 337 93

- *A-G v Guardian Newspapers Ltd (No 2)* [1988] 3 All England Law Reports 545, 95–6
- *A v. Hoare, C v. Middlesbrough Council, X and another v. London borough of Wandsworth, H v. Suffolk County Council, Young v. Catholic Care (Diocese of Leeds) and others*, [2008] United Kingdom House of Lords Decisions 6 21
- *Associated Newspapers Limited v. His Royal Highness the Prince of Wales*, [2006] England and Wales Court of Appeal Civil Division 1776 93
- *Attorney General v Observer Ltd* [1990] 1 Appeal Cases 109 93
- *Attorney General v. Guardian Newspapers No 2*, [1990] 1 Appeal Cases 109 93
- *Australian Broadcasting Corp v Lenah Game Meats Pty Ltd* (2001) 185 American Law Reports 1 98
- *Bluck v. The Information Commissioner*, [2007] WL 4266111 93
- *Campbell v. MGN Ltd*, [2004] United Kingdom House of Lords Decisions 22 241
- *CC v. AB*, [2006] High Court of England and Wales 3083 (QB), 2006 WL 3485386 93
- *Cour de Cassation*, Bulletin des arrêts, Chambres civiles, avril 1988, 1. Ch. civ. Nr. 98, p. 67 – *Farah Diba* 46
- *David Murray v. Express Newspapers plc, Big Pictures (UK) Limited*, [2007] High Court of England and Wales 1908 (Ch) 93
- *Freeman v. Home Office (no. 2)* [1984] England and Wales Court of Appeal Civil Division, All England Law Reports 1036, 21
- *Hellewell v Chief Constable of Derbyshire*, [1995] 4 All England Law Reports 473 [1995] 1 WLR 804 98
- *Huntley v. Thornton*, [1957] 1 All England Law Reports 234, 135
- *In re S (FC) (a child)*, [2004] United Kingdom House of Lords Decisions 47, 94
- *Jean F Jones v. University of Warwick*, [2003] England and Wales Court of Appeal Civil Division 151 93
- *Katz v. United States*, 389 Supreme Court (1967), 347 47
- *Kay and Others and Another (FC) v. London Borough of Lambeth and Others*, [2006] United Kingdom House of Lords Decisions 10 93
- *Long Beach Limited and Denis Christel Sassou Nguesso v. Global Witness Limited*, [2007] High Court of England and Wales 1980 (QB) 93
- *Lord Walker of Gestingthorpe*, [2007] United Kingdom House of Lords Decisions 21 96
- *Mainstream Properties Limited (Appellants) v. Young and others and another (Respondents)*, [2007] United Kingdom House of Lords Decision 21 96
- *McKennitt v. Ash*, [2005] High Court of England and Wales 3003 (QB) 93

- *Morgan v. Fry* [1967] 2 All England Law Reports 386, 135
- *Mosley v News Group Newspapers Ltd.* [2008] High Court of England and Wales 1777 (QB) 2–3
- *P v D*, [2000] 2 New Zealand Law Reports 591 98–100
- *R v Broadcasting Standards Commission, ex p BBC*, [2000] 3 All England Law Reports 989 98
- *R v Broadcasting Standards Commission, ex p BBC*, [2001] QB 885, 98
- Sedley LJ in *Douglas v. Hello* [2001] 2 All England Law Reports 289, [2001] QB 967 107
- *Tribunal de grande instance de Paris*, Recueil Dalloz Sirey 1977, Jurisprudence pp. 364 et seq. – *Caroline von Monaco* 42–7
- *Wainwright v. Home Office*, [2003] United Kingdom House of Lords Decisions 53 93
- *William L Prosser*, *Privacy* (1960) 48 Calif LR 383, 98

Table of legislation |

European Law

Treaty on European Union (TEU)

Article 6(3) 9–10, 22

European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR)

Article 1	11, 34, 111, 114, 115, 137, 139, 141
Article 2	115–19, 121, 123, 142
Article 3	112, 115, 121–22
Article 4	115, 118–19, 123
Article 5	115–16, 123, 148–49, 152, 305
Article 5(1)	16–20
Article 6	115–16, 144, 148, 150
Article 6(2)	34, 301
Article 7	115–16
Article 8	7, 19–20, 24, 39, 112, 115, 121–35, 138–41, 143–47, 150–52, 290–91, 301, 304, 307–08, 310–11
Article 9	115–16, 123, 301
Article 10	40, 115–16, 123, 139–41, 150–52, 289–92, 294, 301, 304, 307–08
Article 11	115–17, 123, 136–38, 301
Article 12	115–16
Article 13	115–16
Article 14	115, 145–46
Article 33	11, 13
Article 34	11, 13, 24, 36, 112, 114
Article 35(1)	18, 114, 148
Article 36(2)	36
Article 41	28
Article 44	28

Article 46	11, 25, 26, 28
Article 53	305, 307–08
Article 60	33, 34

Protocol to the European Convention on Human Rights

Article 1	14–15, 121, 123–24, 127, 146
Article 2	112

United Nation Convention on the Rights of the Child of 20 November 1989

Article 19	121
Article 28	112
Article 37	121

German Law

Grundgesetz (GG); Basic Law for the Federal Republic of Germany

Preamble	32
Article 1(1)	4–5, 38–40, 310–12
Article 2(1)	4–5, 38–40, 310–12
Article 4	311
Article 5(1)	38–40
Article 5(2)	39–40
Article 6	4–5, 27
Article 12	311
Article 20(3)	27, 29, 32, 36
Article 23	31
Article 24(2)	31
Article 24(3)	31
Article 25	24, 31
Article 26	31
Article 28(1)	27
Article 50	23
Article 59	23, 33, 34, 111
Article 91(1)	27

Bürgerliches Gesetzbuch (BGB); German Civil Code

Section 249	312
Section 253	311
Section 823	308, 310–11

Section 852	16, 18, 20–22
Section 1356	8
Section 1357	8, 10

**Einführungsgesetz zum Bürgerlichen Gesetzbuche (EGBGB);
Introductory Law to the German Civil Code**

Article 15(1)	8
Article 16(2)	8, 10, 22

Strafgesetzbuch (StGB); German Criminal Code

Section 7(1)	9, 10, 22
--------------	-----------

Kunsturhebergesetz (KUG)

Section 22	147
Section 23	146–47

Law of the United Kingdom

Land Registration Act 1925

Section 75(1)	15
---------------	----

Limitation Act 1980

Section 11	21–22
Section 14	21
Section 15	14–15
Section 17	14–15
Section 33	21–22
Section 37	14–15

Human Rights Act 1998

Section 2(1)	12, 14, 20, 22, 30
Section 3(1)	12, 20–21, 30
Section 6	31
Section 10(2)	11