

Contents

INTRODUCTION	7
Some definitions	7
LGBT	7
Sexual orientation	7
Gender identity	8
Sexual orientation, gender identity and international and European human rights law	8
Aims of the study	9
Structure of the study	9
Part One: What are the rights invoked and how are they respected? General principles	9
<i>General principles for reviewing the applicability of the rights, article by article</i>	9
<i>General principles for reviewing conformity with a right</i>	9
Part Two: What protection is offered by the Convention? Circumstantial solutions	10
<i>Theme by theme</i>	10
<i>Common European legal rules, uncommon legal rules</i>	10
PART ONE – GROUNDS FOR RELYING ON THE ECHR IN MATTERS RELATING TO SEXUAL ORIENTATION AND GENDER IDENTITY: GENERAL PRINCIPLES	11
I – RELIANCE ON THE GROUND OF FREEDOM: ARTICLES 8, 6, 11, 13, 1P1... OF THE CONVENTION	13
SECTION 1. – WHAT ARE THE MAIN FREEDOMS RELIED ON?	13
§1 – Article 8: right to respect for private and family life and the home	13
A – Article 8: private life	13
Private life and sexual orientation	14
<i>Kozak v. Poland, 2 March 2010, no. 13102/02</i>	14
<i>Antonio Mata Estevez v. Spain, 10 May 2001, no. 56501/00</i>	14
<i>Fernando dos Santos Couto v. Portugal, 21 September 2010, no. 31874/07</i>	14
<i>Dudgeon v. the United Kingdom, 22 October 1981, no. 7525/76</i>	15
<i>A.D.T. v. the United Kingdom, 31 July 2000, no. 35765/97</i>	15
Private life and gender identity	15
<i>Schlumpf v. Switzerland, 9 January 2009, no. 29002/06</i>	15
B – Article 8: family life	16
The right to respect for family life protects stable same-sex relationships	16
<i>Schalk and Kopf v. Austria, 24 June 2010, no. 30141/04</i>	16
The right to respect for family life protects pre-existing parental relationships	17
<i>Salgueiro da Silva Mouta v. Portugal, 21 December 1999, no. 33290/96</i>	17
The right to respect for family life protects the relationship between two same-sex partners and the child of one of them living together in the same household	18
<i>X. and Others v. Austria, 19 February 2013, no. 19010/07</i>	18
The right to respect for family life protects a transgender person in his/her relationship with his/her partner and in the parental relationship with his/her partner's child	18
<i>X, Y and Z v. the United Kingdom, 22 April 1977, no. 21830/93</i>	18
The right to respect for family life guarantees neither the right to found a family nor the right to adopt	18
<i>E.B. v. France, 22 January 2008, no. 43546/02</i>	19
C – Article 8: the home	19

<i>Karner v. Austria</i> , 24 July 2003, no. 40016/98	20
<i>Kozak v. Poland</i> , 2 March 2010, no. 13102/02	20
§2 – Article 1 of Protocol No 1: the right to protection of property	20
<i>J. M. v. the United Kingdom</i> , 28 September 2010, no. 37060/06	21
§3 – Article 11: the right to freedom of assembly and association	22
<i>Bączkowski and others v. Poland</i> , 3 May 2007, no. 1543/06, and <i>Alekseyev v. Russia</i> , 21 October 2010, no. 4916/07, 25924/08 and 14599/09	22
§4 – Articles 6 and 13: the right to a fair hearing and the right to an effective remedy	23
A – Article 6: the right to a fair hearing	23
<i>Van Kück v. Germany</i> , 12 June 2003, no. 35968/97	24
B – Article 13: the right to an effective remedy (and other related articles)	25
<i>H.G. and G.B. v. Austria</i> , 2 June 2005, no. 11084/02 and 15306/02	26
<i>Wolfmeyer v. Austria</i> , 26 May 2005, no. 5263/03	26
§5 – Article 3: the right not to be subjected to torture or inhuman or degrading treatment	27
<i>X v. Turkey</i> , 9 October 2012, no. 24626/09	27
SECTION 2. – HOW IS RESPECT FOR FREEDOMS REVIEWED?	27
II – RELIANCE ON THE GROUND OF THE RIGHT OF NON-DISCRIMINATION: ARTICLE 14 OF THE CONVENTION AND ARTICLE 1 OF PROTOCOL NO. 12	29
<i>Salgueiro da Silva Mouta v. Portugal</i> , 21 December 1999, no. 33290/96	30
<i>P.V. v. Spain</i> , 30 November 2010, no. 35159/09	30
SECTION 1. – IN WHAT FIELDS CAN THE RIGHT TO NON-DISCRIMINATION BE RELIED ON?	30
§1. – The scope of Article 14 of the Convention	31
<i>Schalk and Kopf v. Austria</i> , 24 June 2010, no. 30141/04	31
A – The applicability of Article 14 to all the rights safeguarded by the Convention	32
<i>Kozak v. Poland</i> , 2 March 2010, no. 13102/02	32
<i>Sheffield and Horsham v. the United Kingdom</i> , 30 July 1998, nos. 31-32/1997/815-816/1018-1019	33
B – The applicability of Article 14 to rights “additional” to the Convention	33
<i>E. B. v. France</i> , 22 January 2008, no. 43546/02	33
<i>P.B. and J.S. v. Austria</i> , 22 July 2010, no. 18984/02	34
§2. – The scope of Article 1 of Protocol No. 12	35
A – The applicability of Article 1 of Protocol No. 12 to all acts of public authorities	35
B – Is Article 1 of Protocol No. 12 applicable only to acts of public authorities?	36
SECTION 2. – HOW IS RESPECT FOR THE RIGHT TO NON-DISCRIMINATION REVIEWED?	36
§1. – Testing for discrimination – general principles	36
<i>L. and V. v. Austria</i> , 9 January 2003, nos. 39392/98 and 39829/98	37
§2. – Testing for discrimination based on sexual orientation and gender identity	37
A – Testing for discrimination based on gender identity	37
<i>P.V. v. Spain</i> , 30 November 2010, no. 35159/09	37
B – Testing for discrimination based on sexual orientation	39
<i>Alekseyev v. Russia</i> , 21 October 2010, nos. 4916/07, 25924/08 and 14599/09	39
PART TWO – THE STANDARD OF PROTECTION UNDER THE ECHR IN MATTERS RELATING TO SEXUAL ORIENTATION AND GENDER IDENTITY: SPECIFIC SOLUTIONS	41
I – THE STANDARD OF PROTECTION AFFORDED TO LESBIANS AND GAYS	43
CHAPTER I – FIELDS GOVERNED BY COMMON EUROPEAN LEGAL RULES	45
SECTION 1 – SEXUAL FREEDOM	45
§1 – The right to sexual freedom: non-criminalisation of homosexual relations	46
A – The ban on criminalising homosexual relations between consenting adults	46
The principle established by the <i>Dudgeon</i> judgment	46
<i>Dudgeon v. United Kingdom</i> , 22 October 1981, no. 7525/76	46
Case law applications	49
<i>Norris v. Ireland</i> , 26 October 1988, no. 10581/83	49
<i>Modinos v. Cyprus</i> , 22 April 1993, no. 15070/89	50
B – The ban on criminalising group or filmed homosexual relations	50
<i>A.D.T. v. the United Kingdom</i> , 31 July 2000, no. 35765/97	50
§2 – The right to equal sexual freedom: the same age of sexual majority for homosexual and heterosexual relations	51
The principle established by the <i>L. and V.</i> judgment	51

<i>L. and V. v. Austria</i> , 9 January 2003, no. 39392/98 and 39829/98 and <i>S. L. v. Austria</i> , 9 January 2003, no. 45330/99	51
Case law applications	52
<i>B. B. v. the United Kingdom</i> , 10 February 2004, no. 53760/00	52
<i>Fernando dos Santos Couto v. Portugal</i> , 21 September 2010, no. 31874/07	52
<i>Wolfmeyer v. Austria</i> , 26 May 2005; <i>H. G. and G. B. v. Austria</i> , 2 June 2005	53
SECTION 2 – PROTECTION AGAINST DIFFERENT FORMS OF VIOLENCE	53
§ 1 – Protection against physical and mental violence	53
A – Protection against detention under conditions contrary to human dignity	53
<i>X v. Turkey</i> , 9 October 2012, no. 24626/09	53
B – Protection against ill-treatment from other inmates	55
<i>Stasi v. France</i> , 20 October 2011, no. 25001/07	55
§2 – Protection against verbal violence	57
<i>Vejdeland v. Sweden</i> , 9 February 2012, no. 1813/07	57
SECTION 3 – ACCESS TO EMPLOYMENT	59
The right of lesbians and gays to enter the armed forces	59
The principle established by the <i>Lustig-Prean and Beckett</i> judgment	59
<i>Lustig-Prean and Beckett v. the United Kingdom</i> , 27 September 1999, no. 31417/96 and 32377/96	59
Case law applications	63
<i>Smith and Grady v. the United Kingdom</i> , 27 September 1999	63
<i>Perkins and R. v. the United Kingdom</i> , 22 October 2002, nos. 43208/98 and 44875/98; <i>Beck, Copp and Bazeley v. the United Kingdom</i> , 22 October 2002, nos. 48535/99, 48536/99 and 48537/99.	63
SECTION 4 – ACCESS TO HOUSING	64
The right of a partner in a same-sex couple to succeed to a tenancy following the other partner's death	64
The principle established by the <i>Karner</i> judgment	64
<i>Karner v. Austria</i> , 24 July 2003, no. 40016/98	64
Case law applications	66
<i>Kozak v. Poland</i> , 2 March 2010, no. 13102/02	66
SECTION 5 – ACCESS TO SERVICES	67
§1 – The right to an extension of sickness insurance coverage between partners in a same-sex couple	67
<i>P.B. and J.S. v. Austria</i> , 22 July 2010, no. 18984/02	67
§2 – Protection against refusal of service to same-sex couples	69
<i>Ladele v. the United Kingdom</i> , 15 January 2013, no. 51671/10 (judgment in the case of <i>Eweida and Others v. the United Kingdom</i> , 15 January 2013, nos. 48420/10, 59842/10, 51671/10 and 36516/10)	70
<i>McFarlane v. the United Kingdom</i> , 15 January 2013, no. 36516/10 (judgment in the case of <i>Eweida and Others v. the United Kingdom</i> , 15 January 2013, nos. 48420/10, 59842/10, 51671/10 and 36516/10)	70
SECTION 6 – FREEDOM TO DEMONSTRATE	71
The principle established by the <i>Bączkowski</i> judgment	71
<i>Bączkowski and Others v. Poland</i> , 3 May 2007, no. 1543/06	71
Case law applications	73
<i>Alekseyev v. Russia</i> , 21 October 2010, nos. 4916/07, 25924/08 and 14599/09	73
<i>Genderdoc-M v. Republic of Moldova</i> , no. 9106/06	75
SECTION 7 – ACCESS TO JUSTICE	76
§1 – The right to effective redress for discrimination in the exercise of freedoms on grounds of sexual orientation	76
The principle established by the <i>Wolfmeyer</i> judgment	76
<i>Wolfmeyer v. Austria</i> , 26 May 2005, no. 5263/03	76
Case law applications	77
<i>H.G. and G.B. v. Austria</i> , 2 June 2005, nos. 11084/02 and 15306/02	77
§2 – The right to effective remedy against violations of the right of gays and lesbians to enter the armed forces	77
The principle established by the <i>Smith and Grady</i> judgment	77
<i>Smith and Grady v. the United Kingdom</i> , 27 September 1999, no. 33985/96 and 33986/96	77
Case law applications	78
<i>Beck, Copp and Bazeley v. the United Kingdom</i> (nos. 48535/99, 48536/99 and 48537/99)	78
§3 – The right to an effective remedy against violations of the right to openly proclaim one's sexual orientation by participating in demonstrations	78
The principle established by the <i>Bączkowski</i> judgment	78
<i>Bączkowski and others v. Poland</i> , 3 May 2007, no. 1543/06	78

Case law applications	79
<i>Alekseyev v. Russia</i> , 21 October 2010, no. 4916/07, 25924/08 and 14599/09	79
<i>Genderdoc-M v. Republic of Moldova</i> , 12 June 2004, no. 9106/06	79
SECTION 8 – THE EXERCISE OF PARENTAL RIGHTS	80
§1 – The same right for all parents, regardless of sexual orientation, to be awarded custody of children	80
<i>Salgueiro da Silva Mouta v. Portugal</i> , 21 December 1999, no. 33290/96	80
§2 – The same maintenance obligations for all parents regardless of sexual orientation	82
<i>J. M. v. the United Kingdom</i> , 28 September 2010, no. 37060/06	82
CHAPTER II – FIELDS FALLING WHOLLY OR PARTIALLY WITHIN THE NATIONAL MARGIN OF APPRECIATION	85
SECTION 1 – ADOPTION: A FIELD LEFT PARTLY TO THE DISCRETION OF STATES: A RIGHT TO THE SAME RULES ON ADOPTION OUTSIDE MARRIAGE FOR ALL PERSONS WISHING TO ADOPT, REGARDLESS OF SEXUAL ORIENTATION	85
§1 – Single-parent adoption: the right to identical treatment of single persons wishing to adopt, regardless of their sexual orientation	86
<i>E.B. v. France</i> , 22 January 2008, no. 43546/02	86
§2 – Second-parent adoption: the right to identical treatment of unmarried couples wishing to adopt, regardless of sexual orientation	90
<i>X. and others v. Austria</i> , 19 February 2013, no. 19010/07	90
SECTION 2 – MARRIAGE: A FIELD LEFT WHOLLY TO THE DISCRETION OF STATES: NON-RECOGNITION OF THE RIGHT TO SAME-SEX MARRIAGE	92
§1 – The option for states to recognise the right to same-sex marriage or not	92
<i>Schalk and Kopf v. Austria</i> , 24 June 2010, no. 30141/04	92
§2 – The option for states to introduce, or not, certain differences of treatment between married couples and civil partnerships	96
<i>Gas and Dubois v. France</i> , 15 March 2012, no. 25951/07	96
<i>X and Others v. Austria</i> , 19 February 2013, no. 19010/07	97
<i>Sabine Boeckel and Anja Gessner-Boeckel v. Germany</i> , 7 May 2013, no. 8017/11	97
II – THE STANDARD OF PROTECTION AFFORDED TO TRANSGENDER PERSONS	99
CHAPTER I – FIELDS GOVERNED BY COMMON EUROPEAN LEGAL RULES	101
SECTION 1 – THE RIGHT TO RECOGNITION OF GENDER REASSIGNMENT	102
§1 – The principle established by the <i>Goodwin</i> judgment	102
<i>Christine Goodwin v. the United Kingdom</i> , 11 July 2002, no. 28957/95	102
§2 – Corollaries of the principle of recognition of gender reassignment	106
A – The introduction of legislation permitting complete gender reassignment and full recognition of the preferred gender	107
<i>L. v. Lithuania</i> , 11 September 2007, no. 27527/03	107
B – Alteration of civil status records following gender reassignment	108
<i>B. v. France</i> , 25 March 1992, no. 13343/87	108
C – The admission in court of medical evidence of transsexuality	111
<i>Van Kück v. Germany</i> , 12 June 2003, no. 35968/97	112
<i>Schlumpf v. Switzerland</i> , 9 January 2009, no. 29002/06	115
D – The public nature of hearings to determine the necessity of gender reassignment surgery	118
<i>Schlumpf v. Switzerland</i> , 9 January 2009, no. 29002/06	118
SECTION 2 – THE RIGHT TO MARRY A PERSON OF THE OPPOSITE SEX FOLLOWING GENDER REASSIGNMENT	119
<i>Christine Goodwin v. the United Kingdom</i> , 11 July 2002, no. 28957/95	119
CHAPTER II – MATTERS FALLING WHOLLY OR PARTIALLY WITHIN THE NATIONAL MARGIN OF APPRECIATION	121
SECTION 1 – THE POSSIBILITY OF REFUSING MARRIED PERSONS THE RIGHT TO LEGAL RECOGNITION OF GENDER REASSIGNMENT	121
The principle established by the <i>Wena and Anita Parry</i> judgment	122
<i>Wena and Anita Parry v. the United Kingdom</i> , 28 November 2006, no. 42971/05; <i>R. and F. v. the United Kingdom</i> , 28 November 2006, no. 35748/05	122
Case law applications	123
<i>H. v. Finland (or Hamalainen v. Finland)</i> , 13 November 2012, no. 37359/09	123
SECTION 2 – THE POSSIBILITY OF REFUSING THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A LEGAL PARENTAL RELATIONSHIP WITH THE PARTNER’S CHILD?	124
<i>X, Y and Z v. the United Kingdom</i> , 22 April 1997, no. 21830/93	124