

## **Riga Graduate School of Law Interdisciplinary Studies**

### ***Series Editorial Board:***

George Ulrich (Ph.D)

Mel Kenny (Dr.iur.)

Ineta Ziemele (Ph.D)

## **VOLUME 1**

*Riga Graduate School of Law Interdisciplinary Studies* is an interdisciplinary series of refereed publications critically analysing current issues in European and international studies. While embracing constitutional, institutional and substantive legal issues, the series aims to integrate legal, economic, philosophical, political and social science perspectives. Titles in the *Riga Graduate School of Law Interdisciplinary Studies* series are intended to be of particular interest to academics, policy makers and practitioners, as well as national and international governmental and non-governmental institutions and bodies.

Established in 1998, the Riga Graduate School of Law (RGSL) has emerged as a pre-eminent centre of legal education and research in the Baltic States. The *Riga Graduate School of Law Interdisciplinary Studies* series documents the broad range of innovative scholarly work undertaken by RGSL academic staff, students and global faculty.



**Ineta Ziemele**

**SEPARATE OPINIONS  
AT THE EUROPEAN COURT  
OF HUMAN RIGHTS**

Riga, 2017

Ziemele, Ineta. Separate opinions at the European Court of Human Rights / Ineta Ziemele. - Riga: Riga Graduate School of Law, 2017, 335 p.

Managing editor: Ligita Gjortlere  
Graphical design: Anda Nordena

© Ineta Ziemele, 2017  
© Riga Graduate School of Law, 2017

ISBN 978-9934-8684-0-5

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

|  |           |
|--|-----------|
| <b>INETA ZIEMELE. The Nature and Role of Separate Opinions.....</b>  | <b>13</b> |
| <b>I. Admissibility Criteria and the Scope of the Convention,<br/>Strike Out .....</b>   | <b>21</b> |
| <b>CASE OF PARRILLO v. ITALY.....</b>  | <b>22</b> |
| JOINT PARTLY DISSENTING OPINION OF JUDGES CASADEVALL,<br>ZIEMELE, POWER-FORDE, DE GAETANO AND YUDKIVSKA                          |           |
| <b>CASE OF MUSTAFA TUNÇ AND FECİRE TUNÇ v. TURKEY .....</b>  | <b>25</b> |
| JOINT CONCURRING OPINION OF JUDGES SPIELMANN,<br>VILLIGER, KARAKAŞ, ZIEMELE AND SPANO  |           |
| <b>CASE OF GROSS v. SWITZERLAND .....</b>  | <b>27</b> |
| JOINT DISSENTING OPINION OF JUDGES SPIELMANN,<br>ZIEMELE, BERRO-LEFÈVRE, ZUPANČIČ, HAJIYEV,<br>TSOTSORIA, SICILIANOS, AND KELLER |           |
| <b>CASE OF THE CHURCH OF JESUS CHRIST<br/>OF LATTER-DAY SAINTS v. THE UNITED KINGDOM.....</b>                                    | <b>30</b> |
| JOINT CONCURRING OPINION OF JUDGES<br>ZIEMELE AND HIRVELA  |           |
| <b>CASE OF BANNIKOV v. LATVIA .....</b>  | <b>32</b> |
| CONCURRING OPINION OF JUDGE DE GAETANO,<br>JOINED BY JUDGE ZIEMELE   |           |
| <b>CASE OF MC FARLANE v. IRELAND .....</b>   | <b>34</b> |
| JOINT DISSENTING OPINION OF JUDGES GYULUMYAN,<br>ZIEMELE, BIANKU AND POWER   |           |
| <b>CASE OF HUTTEN-CZAPSKA v. POLAND .....</b>  | <b>43</b> |
| CONCURRING OPINION OF JUDGE ZIEMELE  |           |
| <b>II. ECHR and Inter-State Disputes.....</b>  | <b>45</b> |
| <b>CASE OF CHIRAGOV AND OTHERS v. ARMENIA.....</b>   | <b>46</b> |
| PARTLY CONCURRING, PARTLY DISSENTING OPINION<br>OF JUDGE ZIEMELE   |           |

|   |            |
|---|------------|
| <b>CASE OF SARGSYAN v. AZERBAIJAN</b> .....   | <b>53</b>  |
| CONCURRING OPINION OF JUDGE ZIEMELE   |            |
| <b>CASE OF ALIŠIĆ AND OTHERS v. BOSNIA AND HERZEGOVINA,<br/>CROATIA, SERBIA, SLOVENIA AND THE FORMER<br/>YUGOSLAV REPUBLIC OF MACEDONIA</b> ..... | <b>56</b>  |
| CONCURRING OPINION OF JUDGE ZIEMELE   |            |
| <b>III. Application of ECHR in Time</b> .....   | <b>61</b>  |
| <b>CASE OF O’KEEFFE v. IRELAND</b> .....  | <b>62</b>  |
| CONCURRING OPINION OF JUDGE ZIEMELE   |            |
| <b>IV Interpretation of ECHR in Light of Relevant International Law</b> ....  | <b>69</b>  |
| <b>CASE OF AL-DULIMI AND MONTANA MANAGEMENT INC.<br/>v. SWITZERLAND</b> .....   | <b>70</b>  |
| PARTLY DISSENTING OPINION OF JUDGE ZIEMELE  |            |
| <b>CASE OF AVOTIŅŠ v. LATVIA</b> .....  | <b>76</b>  |
| JOINT DISSENTING OPINION OF JUDGES ZIEMELE,<br>BIANKU AND DE GAETANO  |            |
| <b>CASE OF VASILIAUSKAS v. LITHUANIA</b> .....  | <b>79</b>  |
| DISSENTING OPINION OF JUDGE ZIEMELE   |            |
| <b>CASE OF MARGUŠ v. CROATIA</b> .....  | <b>90</b>  |
| JOINT CONCURRING OPINION OF JUDGES ZIEMELE,<br>BERRO-LEFÈVRE AND KARAKAŞ  |            |
| <b>CASE OF JANOWIEC AND OTHERS v. RUSSIA</b> .....  | <b>94</b>  |
| JOINT PARTLY DISSENTING OPINION OF JUDGES ZIEMELE,<br>DE GAETANO, LAFFRANQUE AND KELLER   |            |
| <b>CASE OF MAKTOUF AND DAMJANOVIĆ<br/>v. BOSNIA AND HERZEGOVINA</b> .....   | <b>108</b> |
| CONCURRING OPINION OF JUDGE ZIEMELE   |            |
| <b>CASE OF MOCANU AND OTHERS v. ROMANIA</b> .....   | <b>111</b> |
| DISSENTING OPINION OF JUDGE ZIEMELE,<br>JOINED BY JUDGE ŠIKUTA  |            |

|  |            |
|--|------------|
| <b>CASE OF SHOLOKHOV v. ARMENIA<br/>AND THE REPUBLIC OF MOLDOVA</b> .....  | <b>115</b> |
| JOINT DISSENTING OPINION OF JUDGES ZIEMELE<br>AND TSOTSORIA  |            |
| <b>CASE OF TONIOLO v. SAN MARINO AND ITALY</b> .....   | <b>118</b> |
| CONCURRING OPINION OF JUDGE ZIEMELE  |            |
| <b>CASE OF BOYAJYAN v. ARMENIA</b> .....   | <b>121</b> |
| CONCURRING OPINION OF JUDGE ZIEMELE  |            |
| <b>CASE OF LALMAHOMED v. THE NETHERLANDS</b> .....   | <b>123</b> |
| CONCURRING OPINION OF JUDGE ZIEMELE  |            |
| <b>CASE OF HANDÖLSDALEN SAMI VILLAGE<br/>AND OTHERS v. SWEDEN</b> .....  | <b>126</b> |
| PARTLY DISSENTING OPINION OF JUDGE ZIEMELE   |            |
| <b>CASE OF VARNAVA AND OTHERS v. TURKEY</b> .....  | <b>131</b> |
| CONCURRING OPINION OF JUDGE ZIEMELE  |            |
| <b>CASE OF ANDREJEVA v. LATVIA</b> .....   | <b>136</b> |
| PARTLY DISSENTING OPINION OF JUDGE ZIEMELE   |            |
| <b>CASE OF KONONOV v. LATVIA</b> .....   | <b>155</b> |
| JOINT DISSENTING OPINION OF JUDGES FURA-SANDSTRÖM,<br>DAVÍD THÓR BJÖRGVINSSON AND ZIEMELE                        |            |
| <b>CASE OF HIRSCHHORN v. ROMANIA</b> .....   | <b>164</b> |
| CONCURRING OPINION OF JUDGE CAFLISCH,<br>JOINED BY JUDGE ZIEMELE (Translation)                                   |            |
| <b>V. Absolute Rights</b> .....  | <b>169</b> |
| <b>CASE OF F.G. v. SWEDEN</b> .....  | <b>170</b> |
| JOINT SEPARATE OPINION OF JUDGES ZIEMELE,<br>DE GAETANO, PINTO DE ALBUQUERQUE AND WOJTYCZEK                      |            |
| <b>CASE OF MUSTAFA TUNÇ AND FECİRE TUNÇ v. TURKEY</b> .....  | <b>179</b> |
| JOINT DISSENTING OPINION OF JUDGES SPIELMANN,<br>KARAKAŞ, ZIEMELE, LÓPEZ GUERRA,<br>AND DE GAETANO (Translation) |            |

|   |            |
|---|------------|
| <b>CASE OF ROHLENA v. THE CZECH REPUBLIC</b> .....  | <b>188</b> |
| CONCURRING OPINION OF JUDGE ZIEMELE   |            |
| <b>CASE OF Y v. LATVIA</b> .....  | <b>191</b> |
| JOINT CONCURRING OPINION OF JUDGES<br>ZIEMELE AND NICOLAOU  |            |
| <b>CASE OF CENTRE FOR LEGAL RESOURCES ON BEHALF<br/>OF VALENTIN CÂMPEANU v. ROMANIA</b> .....   | <b>192</b> |
| JOINT PARTLY DISSENTING OPINION OF JUDGES<br>ZIEMELE AND BIANKU   |            |
| <b>CASE OF ZARZYCKI v. POLAND</b> .....   | <b>194</b> |
| JOINT DISSENTING OPINION OF JUDGES ZIEMELE<br>AND KALAYDJIEVA   |            |
| <b>CASE OF S.H.H. v. THE UNITED KINGDOM</b> .....   | <b>196</b> |
| JOINT DISSENTING OPINION OF JUDGES ZIEMELE,<br>DAVID THÓR BJÖRGVINSSON AND DE GAETANO   |            |
| <b>CASE OF HARITONOV v. MOLDOVA</b> .....   | <b>199</b> |
| SEPARATE OPINION OF JUDGE ZIEMELE JOINED BY<br>JUDGE GYULUMYAN  |            |
| <b>CASE OF GIULIANI AND GAGGIO v. ITALY</b> .....   | <b>201</b> |
| JOINT PARTLY DISSENTING OPINION OF JUDGES ROZAKIS,<br>TULKENS, ZUPANČIČ, GYULUMYAN, ZIEMELE, KALAYDJIEVA<br>AND KARAKAŞ (Translation) |            |
| JOINT PARTLY DISSENTING OPINION OF JUDGES TULKENS,<br>ZUPANČIČ, ZIEMELE AND KALAYDJIEVA   |            |
| <b>CASE OF CARABULEA v. ROMANIA</b> .....   | <b>209</b> |
| PARTLY DISSENTING OPINION OF JUDGE ZIEMELE  |            |
| <b>CASE OF GÄFGEN v. GERMANY</b> .....  | <b>212</b> |
| JOINT PARTLY CONCURRING OPINION OF JUDGES TULKENS,<br>ZIEMELE AND BIANKU (Translation)  |            |
| JOINT PARTLY DISSENTING OPINION OF JUDGES ROZAKIS,<br>TULKENS, JEBENS, ZIEMELE, BIANKU AND POWER                                      |            |

|   |            |
|---|------------|
| <b>VI. Qualified Rights</b> .....   | <b>221</b> |
| <b>CASE OF HÄMÄLÄINEN v. FINLAND</b> .....  | <b>222</b> |
| CONCURRING OPINION OF JUDGE ZIEMELE   |            |
| <b>CASE OF NATIONAL UNION OF RAIL, MARITIME<br/>AND TRANSPORT WORKERS v. THE UNITED KINGDOM</b> .....                                 | <b>225</b> |
| JOINT CONCURRING OPINION OF JUDGES ZIEMELE,<br>HIRVELÄ AND BIANKU   |            |
| <b>CASE OF VALLIANATOS AND OTHERS v. GREECE</b> .....   | <b>228</b> |
| JOINT CONCURRING OPINION OF JUDGES CASADEVALL,<br>ZIEMELE, JOČIENĚ AND SICILIANOS (Translation)                                       |            |
| <b>CASE ANIMAL DEFENDERS INTERNATIONAL<br/>v. THE UNITED KINGDOM</b> .....  | <b>231</b> |
| JOINT DISSENTING OPINION OF JUDGES ZIEMELE, SAJÓ,<br>KALAYDJIEVA, VUČINIĆ AND DE GAETANO  |            |
| <b>CASE X AND OTHERS v. AUSTRIA</b> .....   | <b>239</b> |
| JOINT PARTLY DISSENTING OPINION OF JUDGES<br>CASADEVALL, ZIEMELE, KOVLER, JOČIENĚ, ŠIKUTA,<br>DE GAETANO AND SICILIANOS (Translation) |            |
| <b>CASE OF NENKOVA-LALOVA v. BULGARIA</b> .....   | <b>249</b> |
| PARTLY DISSENTING OPINION OF JUDGES ZIEMELE,<br>NICOLAOU AND BIANKU   |            |
| <b>CASE OF GENDERDOC-M v. MOLDOVA</b> .....   | <b>253</b> |
| JOINT DISSENTING OPINION OF JUDGES GYULUMYAN<br>AND ZIEMELE   |            |
| <b>CASE OF DIAMANTE AND PELLICIONI v. SAN MARINO</b> .....  | <b>256</b> |
| DISSENTING OPINION OF JUDGE ZIEMELE<br>JOINED BY JUDGE TSOTSORIA  |            |
| <b>CASE OF SINDICATUL “PĂSTORUL CEL BUN” v. ROMANIA</b> .....   | <b>258</b> |
| JOINT DISSENTING OPINION OF JUDGES ZIEMELE<br>AND TSOTSORIA   |            |
| <b>CASE OF TSATURYAN v. ARMENIA</b> .....   | <b>262</b> |
| CONCURRING OPINION OF JUDGE ZIEMELE   |            |



**CASE OF ARVELO APONTE v. THE NETHERLANDS** ..... 265  
 JOINT DISSENTING OPINION OF JUDGES ZIEMELE,  
 TSOTSORIA AND PARDALOS

**CASE OF GILLBERG v. SWEDEN** ..... 268  
 JOINT DISSENTING OPINION OF JUDGES GYULUMYAN  
 AND ZIEMELE

**CASE OF PERDIGAO v. PORTUGAL** ..... 272  
 JOINT CONCURRING OPINION OF JUDGES ZIEMELE  
 AND VILLIGER

**CASE OF FUȘCĂ v. ROMANIA** ..... 274  
 DISSENTING OPINION OF JUDGE ZIEMELE

**CASE OF GROSARU v. ROMANIA** ..... 276  
 CONCURRING OPINION OF JUDGE ZIEMELE

**CASE OF SANOMA UITGEVERS B.V. v. THE NETHERLANDS** ..... 278  
 DISSENTING OPINION OF JUDGE POWER JOINED BY JUDGES  
 GYULUMYAN AND ZIEMELE

**CASE OF STOLL v. SWITZERLAND** ..... 282  
 CONCURRING OPINION OF JUDGE ZIEMELE

**CASE OF EVANS v. THE UNITED KINGDOM** ..... 284  
 JOINT DISSENTING OPINION OF JUDGES TÜRMEŃ,  
 TSATSA-NIKOLOVSKA, SPIELMANN AND ZIEMELE

**VII. Effective Remedies and Procedures** ..... 291

**CASE OF LIĢERES v. LATVIA** ..... 292  
 DISSENTING OPINION OF JUDGE ZIEMELE

**CASE OF SALDUZ v. TURKEY** ..... 294  
 JOINT CONCURRING OPINION OF JUDGES ROZAKIS,  
 SPIELMANN, ZIEMELE AND LAZAROVA TRAJKOVSKA

**CASE OF SATIK v. TURKEY (No. 2)** ..... 299  
 CONCURRING OPINION OF JUDGE ZIEMELE

|   |            |
|---|------------|
| <b>CASE OF HERMI v. ITALY</b> .....   | <b>301</b> |
| JOINT DISSENTING OPINION OF JUDGES ROZAKIS,<br>SPIELMANN, MYJER AND ZIEMELE (Translation) |            |
| <b>CASE OF McKAY v. THE UNITED KINGDOM</b> .....  | <b>305</b> |
| JOINT SEPARATE OPINION OF JUDGES ROZAKIS, TULKENS,<br>BOTOCHAROVA, MYJER AND ZIEMELE      |            |
| <b>VIII. Just Satisfaction</b> .....  | <b>309</b> |
| <b>CASE OF ROMAN ZAKHAROV v. RUSSIA</b> .....   | <b>310</b> |
| PARTLY DISSENTING OPINION OF JUDGE ZIEMELE  |            |
| <b>CASE OF VINTER AND OTHERS v. THE UNITED KINGDOM</b> .....                              | <b>312</b> |
| CONCURRING OPINION OF JUDGE ZIEMELE   |            |
| <b>CASE OF BARBORSKI v. BULGARIA</b> .....  | <b>315</b> |
| CONCURRING OPINION OF JUDGE ZIEMELE   |            |
| <b>CASE OF DİSK AND KESK v. TURKEY</b> .....  | <b>317</b> |
| JOINT DISSENTING OPINION OF JUDGES ZIEMELE<br>AND KARAKAŞ                                 |            |
| TABLE OF CASES .....  | 319        |
| INDEX .....   | 327        |