

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	19
---------------------------------	----

INTRODUCTION

I. A transformation in the case law of international human rights courts . . .	23
II. Consequences of the transformation: direct applicability of indications on implementation and execution in the judgments of international human rights courts	26
III. Problematic aspects of direct applicability of indications on execution and implementation: conflict with states' discretion in implementation of international judgments	35
IV. Object and structure of the present study	38
V. Relevance of the present study.	40

PART I: DISCRETION IN IMPLEMENTATION AND DIRECT APPLICABILITY AS APPLIED TO JUDGMENTS OF INTERNATIONAL COURTS

CHAPTER I

DISCRETION IN THE IMPLEMENTATION OF INTERNATIONAL OBLIGATIONS

I. DISCRETION IN IMPLEMENTATION AS A GENERAL PRINCIPLE	47
A. Limits to discretion in implementation.	47
B. Evolution towards reduced discretion in implementation	52
II. DISCRETION IN THE IMPLEMENTATION OF INTERNATIONAL JUDGMENTS, PARTICULARLY IN THE EUROPEAN HUMAN RIGHTS PROTECTION SYSTEM.	53
A. Discretion in the implementation of international judgments	53
B. Increased preciseness as restriction of freedom in implementation . .	56

CHAPTER II

DIRECT APPLICABILITY

I. INTRODUCTION.	61
A. The choice for direct applicability as theoretical framework.	61
B. Decisions of international jurisdictions as international legal rules . .	64

II. DIRECT APPLICABILITY OF INTERNATIONAL TREATY NORMS	67
A. Direct applicability and its relevance.	68
B. Different denominations	71
C. Causes for diversity of opinions and lack of clarity	72
D. The precondition for direct applicability: validity in domestic law . .	75
E. First test for establishing direct applicability.	78
F. Second test for establishing direct applicability: domestic law criteria. .	81
1. Attribution of rights to individuals	81
2. Intention of the parties	84
3. The wording of the treaty provision	86
a) Problems	86
b) The minimum directly applicable content.	90
4. The ability of the domestic organ to apply the norm	95
G. Domestic or international law?	98
H. Distinction between applicability and application	99
I. Conclusion	105
III. DIRECT APPLICABILITY OF INTERNATIONAL JUDGMENTS	107
A. Validity in domestic law	108
1. Need for a specific incorporation act?	109
a) Introduction	109
b) Incorporation by virtue of conferral of power on the international jurisdiction	112
c) Incorporation by virtue of the nature of international judgments .	115
2. Situation in some states parties to the European Convention on Human Rights.	134
a) Provisions providing explicitly or implicitly for the (non-) incorporation of ECtHR judgments	135
b) Judicial practice implying or presupposing incorporation of ECtHR judgments	136
c) Laws on the execution of ECtHR judgments	138
d) Reopening of proceedings	141
e) Other effects	149
f) Scholarly views	150
g) Conclusion	153
3. Situation in some Latin-American states parties to the American Convention on Human Rights	154
a) Constitutional provisions.	154

b) Provisions incorporating international decisions into domestic law	154
c) Mechanisms for the execution of international judgments . .	155
d) Reopening of proceedings	156
e) Conclusion	157
4. One example from Africa	157
5. Conclusion on the validity of international judgments in domestic law	159
B. Internal applicability	161
IV. CONCLUSION	168

PART II: EMPIRICAL ANALYSIS OF THE DECISIONS OF THE THREE INTERNATIONAL HUMAN RIGHTS COURTS

OBJECTIVES OF PART II	173
---------------------------------	-----

CHAPTER I

ANALYSIS OF THE CASE LAW OF THE EUROPEAN COURT OF HUMAN RIGHTS

I. METHODOLOGY.	177
A. Selection of judgments	177
B. Examination of judgments	182
II. EVOLUTION OF THE COURT'S CASE LAW AND RESULTS OF THE ANALYSIS	185
A. The initial practice of the Court: a refusal to make indications	185
1. Measures refused	186
2. Principled reasons.	194
3. Reasons related to the particular case	199
4. Conclusion	200
B. Evolution of the case law	201
1. The first step: Papamichalopoulos and Others v. Greece	201
2. The second step: Scozzari and Giunta v. Italy	205
3. The Court's first individual indications	207
4. The third step: Broniowski v. Poland.	213
5. The novelties introduced by pilot judgments	215
6. "Quasi-pilot" judgments	220
7. Later development of the Court's case law	222
C. Overview of indications provided by the Court	227
1. Criteria for establishing directly applicable character	228

2. Pilot judgments (legally binding general measures)	236
a) Measures indicated	236
b) Direct applicability	240
3. Non-legally binding general measures	243
a) Indications under Article 41	244
b) Indications under Article 46	245
c) Directly applicable indications	259
d) Conclusions on non-binding general indications	260
4. Individual measures	264
a) Legally binding individual indications	264
b) Non-legally binding individual indications	277
c) Conclusions on individual indications	293
5. Conclusions on the indications provided by the Court	298
D. The reasoning used by the Court	300
1. From refusal to willingness: changes in the case law of the Court concerning the same measures	301
a) Annulling or withdrawing administrative and judicial acts or decisions	301
b) Abolishing provisions of legislation	304
c) Passing legislation	305
d) Amending legislation	307
e) Other structural measures	307
f) Retrial of the applicant	308
g) Reducing a sentence imposed on the applicant	310
h) Conducting investigations	310
i) Regulating contact between parent and child	315
j) Conclusions	316
2. Comparison of legally binding and non-legally binding indications	318
a) Retrial or reopening of proceedings	319
b) Return of property	325
c) Execution of domestic judgments	333
d) Paying the judgment debt declared in favour of the applicant	336
e) Refraining from deporting the applicant	339
f) Placing or admitting the applicant to a facility that can provide for their health needs	341
g) Putting an end to on-going criminal proceedings	344
h) Annulling or revoking a judicial act	346

i) Releasing the applicant from detention	347
j) Conclusions.	352
3. General reasoning lines related to Articles 41 and 46 ECHR . . .	353
a) Article 41 or Article 46?	353
b) Article 41	355
c) Article 46	392
d) Reasoning common to Articles 41 and 46	412
e) The relationship between Articles 41 and 46	423
f) Analysis of separate opinions.	428
E. Conclusions from the analysis of the Court's practice and its reasoning	440
III. LEGAL ANALYSIS: POSSIBILITIES FOR ESTABLISHING A POWER OF THE ECTHR TO ADDRESS SPECIFIC INDICATIONS	443
A. The text of the Convention	443
1. Provisions concerning directly a power of the Court	443
a) Interpretations of Article 41	445
b) Article 46	462
2. Provisions concerning indirectly a power of the Court	469
B. The context of the Convention: Subsequent practice	470
C. Inherent powers.	475
D. Acceptable infringement	477
E. The context of the Court: relation to the Committee of Ministers and to states parties	478
IV. CONCLUDING REMARKS ON THE CASE LAW OF THE ECTHR ON INDICATIONS	486

CHAPTER II

ANALYSIS OF THE CASE LAW OF THE INTER-AMERICAN COURT OF HUMAN RIGHTS AND OF THE AFRICAN COURT ON HUMAN AND PEOPLES' RIGHTS

I. INTRODUCTION.	499
II. THE INTER-AMERICAN COURT OF HUMAN RIGHTS	499
A Introduction.	499
B Methodology	500
C Analysis of the Court's case law on reparations	503
1. General characteristics of the Court's case law on reparations . . .	503

a) Abundance and consistency	503
b) Powers of the Court and obligations of the states	504
c) The principle of full reparation	512
d) The relation between restitution and other reparation measures	514
2. Direct applicability in the Inter-American Court's case law on reparations	516
a) Restitution measures	517
b) Rehabilitation measures	520
c) Satisfaction measures	523
d) Guarantees of non-repetition	528
e) Legislative measures	531
f) The obligation to investigate.	533
g) Conclusions.	536
3. Other aspects of the Inter-American Court's case law	537
a) Relations between domestic and international law	537
b) The nature of reparations	548
D. Conclusions and main differences to the European Court of Human Rights	561
III. THE AFRICAN COURT ON HUMAN AND PEOPLES' RIGHTS	567
A. Introduction.	567
B. Methodology	569
C. Analysis of the Court's case law concerning indications on execution or implementation	569
1. The legal basis of the Court and the interpretation it has made of its reparations power.	569
2. The measures rejected by the Court	572
3. Individual measures granted and directly applicable character	580
4. General measures granted and directly applicable character	583
D. Conclusions.	587

CONCLUDING PART

I. METHODOLOGICAL SUMMARY.	593
II. RECAP OF CONCLUSIONS FROM PART I	594
III. RECAP OF CONCLUSIONS FROM PART II.	596

IV. WHAT ARE INTERNATIONAL HUMAN RIGHTS COURTS STRIVING FOR?	601
A. A quest for effectiveness	601
B. Why do international human rights courts feel the need to intervene in the implementation of their judgments?	602
C. Why direct applicability?	603
D. Partnering with domestic jurisdictions as method to improve execution and implementation	605
V. PROBLEMATIC ASPECTS.	607
A. Problems related to the admissibility of direct applicability.	607
B. The restriction of discretion in implementation.	609
C. The states' defence barrier	613
VI. FINAL CONCLUSION AND FINAL REMARKS	615
EPILOGUE: THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE INDICATIONS OF INTERNATIONAL HUMAN RIGHTS COURTS FOR DOMESTIC ADMINISTRATIVE LAW.	625
ANNEX I: EXAMPLES OF DIFFERENT INDICATIONS IN THE ECTHR'S CASE LAW	633
ANNEX II: NUMERICAL SUMMARY OF THE INDICATIONS OF THE EUROPEAN COURT OF HUMAN RIGHTS	639
REFERENCES	641
JUDICIAL DECISIONS	665