

# **Re-designing the admissibility model of the European Court of Human Rights**

Dissertation

der Rechtswissenschaftlichen Fakultät

der Universität Zürich

zur Erlangung der Würde eines Doktors der

Rechtswissenschaft

vorgelegt von

**Robin Schädler**

von Balzers FL

Genehmigt auf Antrag von

Prof. Dr. Oliver Diggelmann

und

Prof. Dr. Daniel Moeckli

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgements .....	I
Table of cases before the Court .....	III
Table of legislation .....	XXIX
Table of abbreviations .....	XXXV
Notes on citation .....	XXXVII
1 Introductory remarks: the Court's legitimacy challenges .....	1
1.1 Authoritativeness of the Court in principle and in procedure .....	2
1.2 Structural imbalance between input and output.....	8
1.3 Non-principled interpretations of admissibility criteria...12	
1.4 Conclusion .....	20
2 Research parameters.....	23
2.1 Aim: establishing reliable expectations.....	23
2.2 Structure.....	25
2.3 Fundamentals.....	28
2.3.1 Definition of terms .....	28
2.3.2 Research gap .....	36
2.3.3 Selecting individual constitutional complaint mechanisms.....	39
2.3.4 Conclusion .....	47
2.4 Methodology .....	48
2.4.1 Comparative legal analysis .....	48
2.4.2 Interpretivist understanding of jurisprudence .....	52
2.4.3 Conclusion .....	56
3 Conceptions of justice lying behind individual constitutional complaints .....	57

3.1	Conceptualising the two dominating theories of justice	57
3.1.1	Communitarian justice: serving community values	59
3.1.2	Egalitarian justice: accentuating formal equality	64
3.1.3	Collective versus individual rationality	66
3.2	The Court's current conception of justice	68
3.2.1	Theory: dual mission based on an all-embracing vision	68
3.2.2	Practice: Indecisive implementation of either concept of justice	75
3.3	Communitarian egalitarianism as the Court's way forward	85
3.3.1	Status quo of the future role	85
3.3.2	Combining communitarian and egalitarian justice	88
3.4	Conclusion	99
4	Seven admissibility models of individual constitutional complaints	104
4.1	General nature of researched constitutional courts	105
4.2	Comparing justifications for formal admissibility criteria	111
4.2.1	Similar wordings	111
4.2.1.1	Wordings of formalities	112
4.2.1.2	Wordings of procedural grounds	115
4.2.1.3	Wordings of jurisdictional grounds	117
4.2.1.4	Conclusion	119
4.2.2	Diverging interpretations in jurisprudence	121
4.2.2.1	Interpretations of formalities	121
4.2.2.2	Interpretations of procedural grounds	131
4.2.2.3	Interpretations of jurisdictional grounds	145
4.2.2.4	Conclusion	159

4.2.3	Partly contradicting justifications for outcome.....	161
4.2.3.1	Justifications for formalities .....	161
4.2.3.2	Justifications for procedural grounds.....	166
4.2.3.3	Justifications for jurisdictional grounds.....	173
4.2.3.4	Conclusion .....	177
4.3	Comparing justifications for substantial admissibility criteria .....	179
4.3.1	Vague wordings .....	180
4.3.1.1	Wordings of the individual dimension of the case.....	181
4.3.1.2	Wordings of the general dimension of the case.....	182
4.3.1.3	Conclusion .....	183
4.3.2	Expansive interpretations in jurisprudence .....	184
4.3.2.1	Interpretations of the individual dimension of the case.....	184
4.3.2.2	Interpretations of the general dimension of the case.....	196
4.3.2.3	Conclusion .....	200
4.3.3	Pragmatic justifications for outcome .....	201
4.3.3.1	Justifications for the individual dimension of the case.....	203
4.3.3.2	Justifications for the general dimension of the case.....	208
4.3.3.3	Conclusion .....	211
4.4	Conclusion .....	213
5	Evaluating admissibility models of individual constitutional complaints .....	216
5.1	Structural benchmark: scope of discretion .....	216

5.2	Substantial benchmark: establishing reliable expectations	220
5.2.1	Reliable expectations and admissibility	220
5.2.2	Conceptual application: unity and clarity	225
5.2.3	Pragmatic application: workload management	231
5.3	Assessing admissibility under structural and substantial benchmarks	233
5.3.1	Scope of discretion: hard and soft admissibility models	234
5.3.2	Reliable expectations: of varying degree	239
5.4	Conclusion	247
6	Re-designing the Court's admissibility model	250
6.1	Preliminary constraints	251
6.2	Formal admissibility criteria under communitarian egalitarianism	256
6.2.1	Formalities: lowering thresholds for non-expert applicants	256
6.2.2	Procedural grounds: expanding redundancy and abuse	270
6.2.3	Jurisdictional grounds: reducing exceptions	288
6.3	Substantial admissibility criteria under communitarian egalitarianism	295
6.3.1	No significant disadvantage: adjustable monetary threshold	296
6.3.2	Manifestly ill-founded: at most every fifth inadmissible case	306
6.4	Exceptions from compliance	320
6.4.1	Discretion for grave individual importance under formal admissibility	320

6.4.2	Discretion for systemic problems under substantial admissibility .....	323
6.5	Conclusion .....	325
7	Concluding remarks .....	336
7.1	Findings on re-designing the Court’s admissibility model	336
7.2	Fields for further research.....	349
	Annex: interview methodology and interview partners .....	353
	Bibliography.....	357