



**THE DANISH
INSTITUTE FOR
HUMAN RIGHTS**

European Master's degree In Human Rights and Democratisation

**The interaction between the European Court of Human Rights and
National Human Rights Institutions: towards a more systematic
interaction?**

Ida Palumbo
E.M.A Student

Eva Ersbøll
Academic Supervisor
The Danish institute for Human Rights

E.M.A Academic year: 2012-2013
University of Southern Denmark

ABSTRACT

National Human Right Institutions and European Court of Human Rights. The firsts, are generally defined as permanent and independent bodies, which governments have established for the specific purpose of protecting human rights, the second is commonly recognised as the highest authority in terms of human rights protection in the European System and often indicated as one of the most successful international courts. What is their relation?

The thesis aims at exploring their interaction on the basis of the current situation and on the ongoing debate, and considers whether the interaction between the Court in Strasbourg and the NHRIs should be more framed and systematised.

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

CDDH	Steering Committee for Human Rights
CEDAW	Convention on the Elimination of Discrimination Against Women
CRPD	Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities
CoE	Council of Europe
ECHR	Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms (referred also as ‘the Convention’)
ECtHR	European Court of Human Rights (referred also as “the Court”)
EU	European Union
ICC	International Coordinating Committee of national institutions for the protection of Human Rights
NHRI(s)	National Institution(s) of Human Rights
ODIHR	Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights
OHCHR	Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights
UN	United Nations

TABLE OF CONTENT

ABSTRACT	3
<i>National Human Right Institutions and European Court of Human Rights. The firsts, are generally defined as permanent and independent bodies, which governments have established for the specific purpose of protecting human rights, the second is commonly recognised as the highest authority in terms of human rights protection in the European System and often indicated as one of the most successful international courts. What is their relation?</i>	<i>3</i>
<i>The thesis aims at exploring their interaction on the basis of the current situation and on the ongoing debate, and considers whether the interaction between the Court in Strasbourg and the NHRIs should be more framed and systematised.</i>	<i>3</i>
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	i
FOREWORD.....	1
INTRODUCTION	1
The choice of the topic and the scope of the thesis.....	1
The structure of the thesis	3
The methodology	4
CHAPTER ONE.....	7
1.1 Outline of the chapter	7
1.2 National Human Rights Institutions	7
1.2.3 What are NHRIs?	7
1.2.3 Historical background and different models of NHRIs	9
1.1.4 Different models, composition and mandate of NHRIs	13
1.1.5 The ICC, the accreditation procedure and the European Regional Group of NHRIs	14

1.5	The European Court of Human Rights	18
1.5.1	The ECtHR and its backlog: a big challenge to cope with it.....	18
1.5.2.	The Reform of the Court	19
1.5.3	The pilot-judgment procedure.....	21
1.5.3.1	22 June 2004: the ECtHR delivers its first judgment in a pilot case.....	23
1.5.4	The NHRIs and the Reform of the ECtHR	25
1.6	Third-party intervention – the Amicus curiae.....	29
1.7	Conclusion of the chapter	32
CHAPTER 2.....		35
2.1	Outline of the chapter	35
2.2	The Study desk.....	36
2.3	Samples of cases in which a NHRI intervened in cases before the ECtHR	36
2.3.1	Brannigan and McBride v. the United Kingdom.....	36
2.3.2	Jordan, McKerr, Kelly and others, and Shanagan v. The United Kingdom	37
2.3.4	Husenatu Bah v. The United Kingdom	41
2.4	The interventions of the European Group of NHRIs	43
2.4.1	D.D. v. Lithuania case	44
2.4.2	Gauer v. France	45
2.5	Conclusion of the chapter	50
CHAPTER THREE.....		52
3.1	Outline of the chapter	52
3.2	The survey.....	52
3.2.1	The aim and the methodology.....	52
3.3	Questions submitted to NHRIs who had intervened before the ECtHR.....	54
3.4	The feedback.....	55

3.4.1.a	Northern Ireland Human Right Commission	56
3.4.1.b	English Equality and Human Rights Commission	57
3.4.1.c	Irish Human Rights Commission.....	60
3.5	Questions submitted to NHRIs who had not intervened before the ECtHR....	60
3.6	The feedback.....	61
3.6.1.a	Institution of the People’s Advocate.	62
3.6.1.b	The Human Rights Ombudsman of Bosnia and Herzegovina.....	62
3.6.1.c	People’s Ombudsman of Croatia.....	63
3.6.1.d	The Danish Institute of Human Rights	64
3.6.1.e	The German Institute for Human Rights	65
3.6.1.f	The National Human Rights Commission of Greece	66
3.6.1.g	Luxembourg Commission for Human Rights.....	68
3.6.1.h	National Ombudsman of Portugal	68
3.6.1.l	The Protector of citizens of Serbia (Ombudsman).....	70
	The outcome of the empirical study.....	71
	CONCLUSIONS	73
	BIBLIOGRAPHY	76