



THE DANISH INSTITUTE
FOR HUMAN RIGHTS

European Master's Degree in Human Rights and Democratisation

Laura Van den Eynde

Master's Thesis

**Litigation Practices of Non-Governmental
Organisations Before the European
Court of Human Rights**

Academic supervisor: Stéphanie Lagoutte

Danish Institute for Human Rights

July 2010

Abstract

This thesis explores the litigation practices of non-governmental organisations dedicated to the promotion and protection of human rights before the European Court of Human Rights. These practices encompass mainly the support to individuals and third party interventions. The involvement of NGOs plays a fundamental role in ensuring access of victims to the Court, creating a level playing field and representing the 'public interest' before it.

Although not well known, these practices are already rather developed and will probably increase. A survey conducted among litigating NGOs sheds light on the concrete way they work and shows that they have many incentives and objectives when going to Strasbourg, which also witnesses some of the Court's strengths. However, they also face numerous challenges, principally due to the Court's rules. Therefore, some suggestions to alleviate NGOs' challenges are examined, as well as the advantages that cooperation with different actors and institutions dedicated to the promotion of human rights bring or could bring. These different points are also the occasion to look at the relationship between the Court and civil society and to call for its enhancement.

Acknowledgments

First, I am heartily thankful to my supervisor, Stéphanie Lagoutte, who since the beginning encouraged and trusted me to explore this subject. This thesis grew out of a series of conversations and her prompt comments on each chapter.

I am also grateful to the Danish Institute for Human Rights, and reiterate my conviction that it is probably one of the best places in the world to write a thesis! Particular thanks go to Eva Maria Lassen and Lone Groth-Rasmussen, who did everything to ensure a smooth stay and were always available for any kind of help. Thanks to Bjørn Dilou Jacobsen, who took precious time to advice me on the survey. I also greatly appreciated the help of Karen Lise Thylstrup in the library. Thanks to the Director of the DIHR, Jonas Christoffersen, who endorsed my survey, thereby allowing me to benefit from the reputation of the Institute.

I owe a special thank to all the participants of the survey, who, although very busy practitioners, lent some of their time to unveil a little part of their work and thoughts and made this thesis possible.

A special thanks to Marie, my cheerful roommate, who provided a place I could call home and to the Masterinis and colleagues with whom I spent these last months.

Thanks to my family for its continued support and enthusiasm. My mother, who proof-read this thesis, is developing expert skills in technical legal vocabulary...

Finally, a loving thank you to Michael who brightened my year!

List of Abbreviations

NGO – Non-Governmental Organisation

NHRI – National Human Rights Institution

ECHR – European Convention on Human Rights

ECtHR – European Court of Human Rights

CoE – Council of Europe

CoM – Committee of Ministers

P14 – Protocol 14 to the European Convention on Human Rights

Table of Contents

INTRODUCTION	1
PART I: THE THEORETICAL AND METHODOLOGICAL FRAMEWORK	3
1. FOCI OF ANALYSIS AND RELEVANCE WITH HUMAN RIGHTS.....	3
A. The Choice of the Forum: the European Court of Human Rights.....	4
1. The limited access of individuals to the Court	4
2. The inequality of arms.....	5
3. The absence of any kind of representation of the ‘public interest’	6
B. The choice of the actor: Non-Governmental Organisations	7
C. Conclusion.....	9
2. METHODOLOGY OF THE SURVEY	9
A. The sample	10
B. The content of the survey	11
C. The process.....	12
3. CONTEXTUALISATION: PUBLIC INTEREST LITIGATION.....	12
A. Public Interest Litigation: an overview.....	13
1. Notion.....	13
2. History	14
3. Theoretical approaches explaining the spread of public interest litigation	15
B. Public Interest Litigation : Critiques.....	16
C. Effectiveness of public interest litigation: the problem of assessment.....	18
PART II : NGOs’ LITIGATION PROFILES AND PRACTICES	21
4. THE “LITIGATION PROFILE” OF THE RESPONDENTS.....	22
5. THE IDENTIFICATION AND SELECTION OF CASES	24
6. TYPES OF INVOLVEMENT IN THE ECtHR PROCEEDINGS.....	25
A. Support to victims.....	26
B. Amicus curiae and third party interventions	28
1. Notion.....	28
2. Rules and Procedures	29

3.	Advantages and disadvantages	32
4.	Evolution of the assumption of impartiality and neutrality.....	34
5.	The practice of third interventions	35
6.	Impact of third interventions	36
PART III :	NGOs MOTIVATIONS TO GO TO THE ECtHR	39
7.	INCENTIVES TO GO TO THE ECtHR.....	39
A.	The non-responsiveness or the opposition of other channels of influence	40
B.	The near-precedential value of the Court’s decisions.....	40
C.	The perception that the Court is a partner in advancing the cause	41
D.	The existence of a monitoring system following-up the Court's decision	42
E.	The opportunity to raise public awareness and mobilise support	43
F.	Presence at this level helps the organisation attract funding and legitimises its goals	45
8.	PURSUED OBJECTIVES	45
A.	To challenge laws, interpretations and practices; to establish a precedent and to influence the Court	45
B.	To extend the interpretation of the European Convention.....	46
C.	To inform the Court	47
D.	To help an individual who otherwise could not afford to be there.....	47
E.	To send a signal to other States	47
F.	To document violation	48
G.	Conclusion.....	48
PART IV:	ANALYSIS OF NETWORKS	49
9.	HUMAN RIGHTS LITIGATION: PATTERNS OF COOPERATION.....	49
A.	Cooperation among Non Governmental Organisations.....	51
B.	Cooperation between NGOs and National Human Rights Institutions	52
C.	Cooperation with smaller grassroots organisations	53
D.	Cooperation with Legal Aid Agencies.....	55
E.	Cooperation with Pro Bono Lawyers.....	55
F.	Cooperation with Private Lawyers	58
G.	Cooperation with Private Public Interest Law Firms	58

H. Cooperation with Law School Clinics	59
I. The Council of Europe Commissioner for Human Rights.....	62
J. Conclusion.....	63
PART V: CHALLENGES AND PROSPECTS	65
10. CHALLENGES AND NGOs’ SUGGESTIONS TO ENHANCE THEIR RELATIONSHIP WITH THE ECtHR	65
A. Lengthy procedures before the Court	66
B. Lack of time to intervene and lack of information	66
C. Restrictive rules on standing	69
D. Lack of financial resources	69
E. Lack of specialized in-house staff and lack of pro bono lawyers	70
F. Reluctance of victims to take their case before the Court.....	70
G. Additional remarks made by groups.....	71
1. The ‘languages’ challenge’	71
2. Silent refused request for intervention	71
3. A call for being invited.....	72
4. Better information on interventions by others	73
H. Conclusion.....	74
11. PROSPECTS	74
A. Strike the iron while it is hot	75
B. An increase in NGOs’ involvement.....	76
C. <i>Lautsi v. Italy</i>	77
CONCLUSION	78
 Bibliography.....	 83
 Appendix 1: Third interventions before the European Court of Human Rights	 105
Appendix 2: Survey on litigation practices before the Eur. Court of Human Rights..	113