

THE CONSTITUTIONAL RELEVANCE OF THE ECHR IN
DOMESTIC AND EUROPEAN LAW

The publication of this Volume has been made possible with the kind support of



Regione Umbria

Consiglio Regionale

Centro Studi Giuridici e Politici

THE CONSTITUTIONAL
RELEVANCE OF THE ECHR IN
DOMESTIC AND EUROPEAN LAW

An Italian Perspective

Edited by

Giorgio REPETTO



intersentia

Cambridge – Antwerp – Portland

Intersentia Publishing Ltd.
Trinity House | Cambridge Business Park | Cowley Road
Cambridge | CB4 0WZ | United Kingdom
Tel.: +44 1223 393 753 | Email: mail@intersentia.co.uk

Distribution for the UK:

NBN International
Airport Business Centre, 10 Thornbury Road
Plymouth, PL6 7 PP
United Kingdom
Tel.: +44 1752 202 301 | Fax: +44 1752 202 331
Email: orders@nbninternational.com

Distribution for the USA and Canada:

International Specialized Book Services
920 NE 58th Ave. Suite 300
Portland, OR 97213
USA
Tel.: +1 800 944 6190 (toll free)
Email: info@isbs.com

Distribution for Austria:

Neuer Wissenschaftlicher Verlag
Argentinerstraße 42/6
1040 Wien
Austria
Tel.: +43 1 535 61 03 24
Email: office@nwv.at

Distribution for other countries:

Intersentia Publishing nv
Groenstraat 31
2640 Mortsel
Belgium
Tel.: +32 3 680 15 50
Email: mail@intersentia.be

The Constitutional Relevance of the ECHR in Domestic and European Law. An Italian Perspective
Giorgio Repetto (ed.)

© 2013 Intersentia
Cambridge – Antwerp – Portland
www.intersentia.com | www.intersentia.co.uk

Artwork on cover: Les trois poètes, Marcoussis Louis (1878-1941) © Musée national d'Art moderne – Centre Georges Pompidou, MNAM-CCI, Dist. RMN-Grand Palais / Jacqueline Hyde

ISBN 978-1-78068-118-4
D/2012/7849/96
NUR 820

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data. A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library.

No part of this book may be reproduced in any form, by print, photoprint, microfilm or any other means, without written permission from the publisher.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

As editor, I would like to thank all the colleagues and friends who made the publication of this volume possible.

First of all, I am grateful to the book's authors, who supported and encouraged me during the early stage of the initiative, and whose contribution, far beyond the articles published here, played an enormous role in the conception of the book. I wish to thank Eric Steven Dennis for his linguistic expertise and his sensitive approach to legal language.

Secondly, I am indebted to the two Institutions that supported the publication: *Centro studi giuridici e politici della Regione Umbria* and its President, avv. Marco Lucio Campiani, who aided us with a financial grant, and *Dipartimento di Diritto pubblico* at the Università di Perugia (Research Unit on 'The Effectiveness of Rights in the Light of the European Court of Human Rights Case Law', <https://diritti-cedu.unipg.it>), for its organizational and financial support.

Thirdly, I am grateful to Ann-Christin Maak of Intersentia and the anonymous reviewers, who helped me clarify the book's main thesis and allowed me to realize this project.

And last but not least, I wish to acknowledge all the people who gave me precious suggestions for every aspect of the book's preparation: Luisa Cassetti, Francesco Cerrone, Silvia Niccolai, Cesare Pinelli and Mauro Volpi.

CONTENTS

| | |
|-------------------------------|------|
| <i>Acknowledgements</i> | v |
| <i>List of Authors</i> | xiii |

INTRODUCTION. THE ECHR AND THE EUROPEAN CONSTITUTIONAL LANDSCAPE: REASSESSING PARADIGMS

| | |
|---|----|
| Giorgio REPETTO..... | 1 |
| 1. The ECHR and the Idea of ‘Constitutional Relevance’..... | 1 |
| 2. The ECHR’S Constitutional Dimension in Domestic Law..... | 7 |
| 3. The Trans-European Constitutional Relevance of the ECHR..... | 9 |
| 4. The ‘Italian’ Perspective..... | 12 |
| 5. Outline of Chapters..... | 13 |

PART I. ESTABLISHING A CONSTITUTIONAL DIMENSION FOR THE ECHR IN DOMESTIC LAW

| | |
|--|----|
| PART I.A. THE RENEWING OF A CONSTITUTIONAL CULTURE: THE ECHR IN ITALIAN DOMESTIC LAW..... | 23 |
|--|----|

The Constitutional Background of the 2007 Revolution. The Jurisprudence of the Constitutional Court

| | |
|---|----|
| Diletta TEGA..... | 25 |
| 1. The Value of the European Convention on Human Rights in the System of National Sources: Doctrinal Reconstructions..... | 25 |
| 2. The Jurisprudence of the Constitutional Court..... | 27 |
| 2.1. The First Phase: A Traditional Dualism..... | 29 |
| 2.2. The Second Phase: A More ‘Modern’ Dualism..... | 31 |
| 2.3. The Third Phase: A Duality ‘In Transformation’..... | 33 |

Rethinking a Constitutional Role for the ECHR. The Dilemmas of Incorporation into Italian Domestic Law

| | |
|---|----|
| Giorgio REPETTO..... | 37 |
| 1. The New Ranking of the ECHR and the Shift to ‘Constitutional Dualism’..... | 37 |
| 2. The Constitutional Background of the 2007 Revolution..... | 41 |

| | |
|---|----|
| 2.1. ‘Abstractness’ and ‘Embeddedness’ in Constitutional Adjudication | 41 |
| 2.2. The Model of the ECHR as ‘Interposed Rule’ and its Institutional Underpinnings | 44 |
| 3. The Quest for Substantial Interaction Between Constitutional and Conventional Guarantees | 45 |
| 4. ‘Italian Style’ and the ECHR: The Current Situation. | 48 |
| 5. The Incorporation of the ECHR: A Matter of Constitutional Theory? | 51 |

Strasbourg Jurisprudence as an Input for ‘Cultural Evolution’ in Italian Judicial Practice

| | |
|---|----|
| Andrea GUAZZAROTTI | 55 |
| 1. Strasbourg Jurisprudence and ‘Culture’ of Judicial Precedent in Italy. | 55 |
| 2. Comparing the Reporting System of the Strasbourg and Italian Jurisprudence. | 56 |
| 3. The ECHR and the ‘ <i>Ad Hoc</i> Balancing Delegated to Courts’ | 58 |
| 4. The ‘Concreteness’ of the Tests Provided by the European Court of Human Rights. | 61 |
| 5. Distinguishing and Decisions No. 348 and No. 349 of 2007 of the Italian Constitutional Court | 62 |
| 6. The <i>Agrati</i> Case, or the Failure of the Italian Way to Manipulate Precedents | 65 |
| 7. Conclusion | 67 |

PART I.B. THE MOST DANGEROUS BREACH? THE RIGHT TO A FAIR TRIAL AND THE QUEST FOR EFFECTIVENESS. 69

The Strasbourg Court’s Influence on the Italian Criminal Trial

| | |
|---|----|
| Mariangela MONTAGNA | 71 |
| 1. The Dialogue Between Courts and the Protection of Fundamental Rights, Between Changing Roles and New Outlooks of Interpretation. | 71 |
| 2. Trial <i>In Absentia</i> and Remedies | 72 |
| 2.1. Pressures From the European Court of Human Rights. | 73 |
| 2.2. ‘Internal’ Solutions: The Legislature’s Action | 74 |
| 2.3. Action by the Constitutional Court | 75 |
| 3. Right to a Public Hearing | 78 |

The ECHR’s Influence on the Italian Regulation of the Administrative Trial. The Right to an Independent and Impartial Tribunal

| | |
|---|----|
| Marta MENGOZZI | 83 |
| 1. Introduction: the Right to a Fair Trial in the Convention System | 83 |
| 2. The Guarantee of the Judge’s Impartiality and the Various Outcomes of the Dialogue Between Legal Systems | 85 |

| | | |
|----|--|----|
| 3. | A Case of Clear ECHR Influence: the So-called Force of Prevention | 86 |
| 4. | A Case of Extremely Complex Dialogue: The Simultaneous Presence of Consultative and Jurisdictional Functions in the Bodies of Administrative Justice | 90 |
| 5. | A Case of Missed Dialogue: Non-judicial Positions Held by Administrative Magistrates | 93 |
| 6. | Conclusion | 94 |

| | | |
|-----------|--|----|
| PART I.C. | ECHR IN NATIONAL CONSTITUTIONS: COMPARATIVE PERSPECTIVES | 97 |
|-----------|--|----|

Toward a Convergence Between the EU and ECHR Legal Systems?

A Comparative Perspective

| | | |
|----|--|-----|
| | Oreste POLLICINO | 99 |
| 1. | The Post-Enlargement Aggressive Phase of the European Court of Human Rights | 99 |
| 2. | The Opposite Post-Enlargement Reaction of the Court of Justice of the European Union | 101 |
| 3. | The National Judicial Treatment of the Supranational Laws. Confirmation or Denial of the Convergence Process Identified at the European Level? | 109 |

National Constitutions and the ECHR. Comparative Remarks in Light of Germany's Experience

| | | |
|----|--|-----|
| | Alessandra DI MARTINO | 119 |
| 1. | Introduction | 119 |
| 2. | The German Federal Constitutional Tribunal and the European Court of Human Rights | 120 |
| | 2.1. <i>The Görgülü-Beschluß</i> | 121 |
| | 2.2. <i>The Caroline-Urteil II</i> | 123 |
| | 2.3. The Judgment on Preventive Detention | 125 |
| 3. | Comparative Remarks | 127 |
| | 3.1. The ECHR in the Italian Legal Order | 127 |
| | 3.2. Non-Application and Construction of Ordinary Law in Harmony with the Convention | 128 |
| | 3.3. Balancing and Reasonability Tests | 129 |
| | 3.4. The Impact of the ECHR and Related Case Law on National Courts and Legislators | 132 |
| 4. | Conclusion | 134 |

PART II. INNER AND OUTER BOUNDARIES: THE RELATIONSHIP OF THE EUROPEAN COURT OF HUMAN RIGHTS WITH CONTRACTING STATES AND WITH THE EU

PART II.A. JUST DEFERENCE? THE MULTIPLE FACETS OF THE DOCTRINE OF MARGIN OF APPRECIATION 137

Teaching of Religion and Margin of Appreciation. The Reluctant Liberalism of the Strasbourg Court

Alberto VESPAZIANI 139

1. The Doctrine of the Margin of Appreciation 139
2. The *Folgerø v. Norway* Case 141
3. The *Hasan and Eylem Zengin v. Turkey* Case 143
4. The Selective Liberalism of the Strasbourg Court 144

The Crucifix and the Margin of Appreciation

Ilenia RUGGIU. 149

1. A Constitutional Conversation over a Religious Symbol 149
2. A Brief History of the ‘Crucifix Issue’ in Italy 150
3. Does the Use of the Margin of Appreciation Limit the Convention’s Rights? 152
4. What are the Conditions for Using the Margin of Appreciation? 154
5. Was there an Alternative to the Margin of Appreciation? 155

The Unbearable Lightness of the Margin of Appreciation: ECHR and ‘Bio-Law’

Antonello CIERVO 159

1. The Margin of Appreciation Doctrine in ECHR Case Law on ‘Bio-Law’: General Profiles of Reconstruction 159
2. State Margin of Appreciation and Beginning of Life Issues. 161
3. State Margin of Appreciation and End of Life Issues 167
4. Concluding Remarks on the Role of the Strasbourg Court on the Sidelines of the ECJ Judgment *Brüstle v. Greenpeace* 170

Histories, Traditions and Contexts in the Jurisprudence of the European Court of Human Rights

Andrea BURATTI 173

1. The Problem of the Use of History in Strasbourg’s Jurisprudence 173
2. Historical Argument in Strasbourg’s Jurisprudence. 175
 - 2.1. Historical Contextualisation and Constitutional Tolerance. 175

| | |
|---|-----|
| 2.2. The Insufficiency of Historical Argument (<i>Sejdić and Finci v. Bosnia-Herzegovina</i>) | 177 |
| 2.3. The Flight From the Communist Past. | 179 |
| 2.4. Principle of Secularism and Historical Traditions | 181 |
| 2.5. The Use of Historical Argument: Open Questions..... | 183 |
| 3. Denying Historical Truth: An Abuse of Law | 184 |
| 4. Towards a Conclusion: Protection of Historical Traditions or Critical Historical Method? | 187 |

| | |
|--|-----|
| PART II.B. COOPERATION IN NEED OF COORDINATION: EUROPEAN COURT OF HUMAN RIGHTS AND THE EU | 189 |
|--|-----|

Immigrants’ Family Life in the Rulings of the European Supranational Courts

| | |
|---|-----|
| Gianluca BASCHERINI | 191 |
| 1. Introduction | 191 |
| 2. The ECtHR’s Jurisprudence on Immigrants’ Right to Private and Family Life. The Progressive but Oscillating Enlargement of the Protection Afforded by Article 8 | 192 |
| 3. The Jurisprudence of the ECJ: Is the Family Going to Market? | 197 |
| 4. Conclusions. Movement of People, Movement of Law | 201 |

Cooperation in Relations Between the ECJ and the ECtHR

| | |
|---|-----|
| Angelo SCHILLACI | 205 |
| 1. Separation and Cooperation | 205 |
| 2. The Opening up of the ECJ and the Comparative Method | 208 |
| 3. EU Law in ECtHR Case Law: Resistance and (Labour) Opening. | 210 |
| 4. The EU Charter of Fundamental Rights in the ECtHR’S Case Law | 212 |
| 5. EUCFR and ‘Horizontal Clauses’ in the ECJ Case Law: Towards Another Centre of Gravity? | 214 |
| 6. Conclusion | 217 |

The EU and its Member States Before the Strasbourg Court. A Critical Appraisal of the Co-Respondent Mechanism

| | |
|--|-----|
| Simone VEZZANI | 221 |
| 1. Preliminary Remarks on the EU Accession to the ECHR: The Problem of Shared Responsibility | 221 |
| 2. The Co-Respondent Mechanism as Envisaged in the Draft Accession Agreement | 225 |
| 2.1. Exclusion of <i>Intervention Forcée</i> | 227 |

| | |
|--|-----|
| 2.2. Admissibility Criteria for Applications | 231 |
| 2.3. Prior Involvement of the ECJ | 232 |
| 3. Conclusion | 235 |

CONCLUDING REMARKS

The Constitutional Relevance of the ECHR in Domestic and European Law.

General Assessments

| | |
|---|-----|
| Cesare PINELLI | 239 |
| 1. 'Constitutional Justice' with Reference to the Strasbourg Court: A Preliminary Assessment | 239 |
| 2. Two Versions of 'Formalism' | 241 |
| 3. The Parallel Evolution of the Strasbourg Court and the Constitutional Courts | 243 |
| 4. Is the ECtHR Challenging the National Systems of Constitutional Adjudication? | 245 |
| 5. How Ordered is 'Ordered Pluralism'? A Tentative Approach | 248 |
| 6. Examples from the Strasbourg Case Law | 249 |

LIST OF AUTHORS

Gianluca Bascherini

Assistant Professor of Constitutional Law, Department of Law, University of Rome “La Sapienza”, Italy (gianluca.bascherini@uniroma1.it)

Andrea Buratti

Assistant Professor of Public Law, Department of Public Law, University of Rome “Tor Vergata”, Italy (buratti@juris.uniroma2.it)

Antonello Ciervo

Research Fellow in Public Law, Department of Public Law, University of Perugia, Italy (anto.ciervo@hotmail.it)

Alessandra Di Martino

Assistant Professor of Comparative Constitutional Law, Department of Law, University of Rome “La Sapienza” (alessandra.dimartino@uniroma1.it)

Andrea Guazzarotti

Associate Professor of Constitutional Law, Department of Economics and Management, University of Ferrara, Italy (andrea.guazzarotti@unife.it)

Marta Mengozzi

Assistant Professor of Public Law, Department of Public Law, University of Rome “Tor Vergata”, Italy (marta.mengozzi@uniroma2.it)

Mariangela Montagna

Associate Professor of Criminal Procedure, Department of Public Law, University of Perugia, Italy (montagna@unipg.it)

Cesare Pinelli

Professor of Public Law, Department of Law, University of Rome “La Sapienza”, Italy (cesarepinelli@tiscali.it)

Oreste Pollicino

Associate Professor of Comparative Public Law, Department of Law, Bocconi University, Milan, Italy (oreste.pollicino@unibocconi.it)

Giorgio Repetto

Assistant Professor of Public Law, Department of Public Law, University of Perugia, Italy (giorgio.repetto@unipg.it)

Ilenia Ruggiu

Associate Professor of Constitutional Law, Department of Law, University of Cagliari, Italy (iruggiu@unica.it)

Angelo Schillaci

Research Fellow in Constitutional Law, Department of Public Law, University of Teramo, Italy (aschillaci@tin.it)

Diletta Tega

Assistant Professor of Constitutional Law, Department of Domestic and International Law, University of Milano-Bicocca, Italy; Clerk at the Italian Constitutional Court (diletta.tega@unimib.it)

Alberto Vespaziani

Associate Professor of Comparative Constitutional Law, Department of Law, University of Molise, Italy (alberto.vespaziani@unimol.it)

Simone Vezzani

Assistant Professor of International and EU Law, Department of Public Law, University of Perugia, Italy (simone_vezzani@libero.it)