

Contents

1	Introduction	1
1.1	The Topic	1
1.2	Clarifications	2
1.3	Outline	3
1.4	The Selection of Material	4
2	Historical and Comparative Perspectives	7
3	Methodological Issues	13
3.1	The General Interpretive Principles of the VCLT	13
3.2	The Interpretive Method Developed by the Strasbourg Court . . .	15
3.2.1	Introduction	15
3.2.2	The Textual Approach	16
3.2.3	The Teleological Approach	17
3.2.3.1	Introduction	17
3.2.3.2	The Role of the Travaux Préparatoires	17
3.2.3.3	An Overview of the Fundamental Interpretive Principles to Which a Teleological Approach Gives Rise	18
3.2.3.4	The Principle of 'Effective Protection'	19
3.2.3.4.1	The Sub-Principle of 'Autonomous Interpretation'	20
3.2.3.4.2	The Sub-Principle of 'Positive Obligations'	21
3.2.3.4.3	The Sub-Principle of 'Review'	21
3.2.3.5	The Principle of 'Dynamic Interpretation'	22
3.2.3.5.1	The Sub-Principle of 'Actual or Emergent Consensus'	23

	3.2.3.5.2	The Sub-Principle of ‘International Consistency’	24
	3.2.3.5.3	The Sub-Principle of ‘General Openness’	25
	3.2.3.6	The Principle of ‘Fair Balance’	26
	3.2.3.7	The Substantive Aspect of the ‘Fair Balance’ Principle	27
	3.2.3.8	The Institutional Aspect of the ‘Fair Balance’ Principle: The Principle of Subsidiarity	30
	3.2.3.8.1	Introductory Comments	30
	3.2.3.8.2	Two Different ‘Margin of Appreciation’ Concepts	31
	3.2.3.8.3	The Principle of Subsidiarity	33
	3.2.3.9	The Procedural Aspect of the ‘Fair Balance’ Principle	35
	3.2.4	Concluding Comments	37
3.3		The ‘Precedence Value’ of the Strasbourg Court’s Case Law . . .	38
	3.3.1	Strasbourg Court Judgments	38
	3.3.2	Admissibility Decisions	39
	3.3.3	How to Approach the Strasbourg Court’s Case Law	40
	3.3.4	The Relevance of Case Law Concerning the Criminal Limb of ECHR Article 6	42
	3.3.5	The Relevance of Case Law Concerning the Substantive Provisions of the ECHR	44
	3.3.6	Concluding Comments	46
3.4		A Brief Remark Concerning Philosophical Premises	46
4		The Various Components of ECHR Article 6(1)	53
	4.1	The Scope of the Civil Limb of ECHR Article 6(1)	53
	4.1.1	Introduction	53
	4.1.2	Concerning ‘Rights and Obligations’	54
	4.1.3	Concerning ‘Determination’	55
	4.1.4	Concerning ‘Civil’	58
	4.2	The Various Procedural Guarantees Established by ECHR Article 6(1)	59
	4.2.1	Introduction	59
	4.2.2	Institutional Guarantees	60
	4.2.3	Access to Court	60
	4.2.4	That the Case Is Properly Handled	64
	4.2.4.1	Introduction	64
	4.2.4.2	The Right to Public Court Proceedings	64
	4.2.4.3	The Right to Speedy Court Proceedings	65
	4.2.4.4	The Right to Fair Court Proceedings	66
	4.3	Different Aspects of the Fairness Standard	67
	4.3.1	Introduction	67
	4.3.2	That the Case Is Heard in a Proper Manner	67
	4.3.3	That There Is No Improper Outside Interference	67

4.3.4	That the Final Judgment Is Reasoned	68
4.3.5	That the Final Judgment Must Not Appear Arbitrary or Manifestly Unreasonable	68
4.3.6	That the Burden of Proof Must Not Be Insurmountable	73
5	Fundamental Aspects of the ‘Fair Hearing’ Right	75
5.1	Introduction	75
5.2	A Philosophical Perspective on the ‘Fair Hearing’ Right	76
5.3	Identifying Competing Considerations	83
5.3.1	Fundamental Ideals	83
5.3.2	Competing Objectives	85
5.4	Conceptualizing the Fairness Standard	89
5.4.1	The Essence of the Fairness Standard: A Right to Proper Participation	89
5.4.2	Whether the National Court May Be Obligated to Conduct a Satisfactory Inquiry of Its Own Motion	93
5.4.3	The Diligence Which Can Be Expected of the Parties to Civil Proceedings	95
5.5	Fundamental Principles Derived from the Fairness Standard	96
5.5.1	Introduction	96
5.5.2	The Adversarial Principle	98
5.5.2.1	Conceptualizing the Adversarial Principle	98
5.5.2.2	Formal and Effective Aspects of the Adversarial Principle	100
5.5.2.3	Some Practical Implications of the Adversarial Principle	102
5.5.2.3.1	The Adversarial Principle Does Not Prohibit the National Court to Play an Active Role	102
5.5.2.3.2	The Adversarial Principle Does Imply That an Effective Opportunity To Be Heard Must Be Given	103
5.5.2.3.3	Two Special Situations: ‘Mass Claim’ Procedures and ‘Closed Material’ Procedures	107
5.5.3	The ‘Equality of Arms’ Principle	111
5.5.3.1	Conceptualizing the ‘Equality of Arms’ Principle	111
5.5.3.2	Formal and Effective Aspects of the ‘Equality of Arms’ Principle	114
5.5.3.3	Some Practical Implications of the ‘Equality of Arms’ Principle	116

	5.5.3.3.1	Whether Unrepresented and Represented Parties May Be Treated Differently	116
	5.5.3.3.2	Whether It Is Permissible to Impose Different Time Limits in Respect of Different Parties	118
	5.5.3.3.3	Implications for Parties Who Face Particularly Challenging Circumstances	118
5.5.4		The Principle of Respectful Treatment	119
5.5.5		The Relationship Between the Right to a ‘Public Hearing’ and the Participation Principles	120
5.5.6		The Relationship Between the Participation Principles and Specific Procedural Safeguards	121
5.6		How the Strasbourg Court Proceeds When Assessing the Fairness of Specific Court Proceedings	128
	5.6.1	That the Proceedings Are To Be Assessed in Their Entirety	128
	5.6.1.1	The Fundamental Tenet: That the Proceedings as a Whole Must Be ‘Fair’	128
	5.6.1.2	The Relationship Between the Overall Assessment and Specific Procedural Complaints	130
	5.6.1.3	Whether Appeal Proceedings May Remedy a Fairness-Related Procedural Deficiency	132
	5.6.2	The Primacy of the National Courts	134
	5.6.2.1	The Distinction Between the Discretion and the Margin of Appreciation of the National Authorities	134
	5.6.2.2	The Scope of the National Authorities’ Discretion	136
	5.6.2.3	The Margin of Appreciation of the National Courts	140
	5.6.3	The Different Types of Problems the ‘Fair Hearing’ Right May Give Rise To	143
5.7		The Proportionality Perspective: General Comments	145
	5.7.1	Introduction	145
	5.7.2	The Role of ‘Appearances’ and the Role of ‘Actual Prejudice’	147
	5.7.2.1	The Dichotomy Between the ‘Appearances’ and the ‘Actual Prejudice’ Perspectives	147
	5.7.2.2	The Manifestation of the ‘Appearances’ and ‘Actual Prejudice’ Perspectives in the Case Law	152

5.7.2.3	Defining the Role of the ‘Appearances’ and ‘Actual Prejudice’ Perspectives in Various Situations	155
5.7.3	‘Appearances’-Related Factors	157
5.7.3.1	How Essential the Safeguard Was for the Party’s Proper Participation	157
5.7.3.2	The Importance of the Proceedings	160
5.7.3.3	How Weighty the Competing Objectives Were	161
5.7.4	Instrumental Factors	164
5.7.4.1	The Fundamental Question: The Practical Significance of the Safeguard in View of the Circumstances	164
5.7.4.2	Factors Which Can Elucidate the Question of Practical Significance	164
5.7.4.2.1	The Nature of the Issue	164
5.7.4.2.2	The Categorization of the Proceedings	165
5.7.4.2.3	How Indisputable the Judgment on the Merits Appears to Have Been	166
5.7.4.2.4	Alternative Opportunities to Participate and Be Heard	168
5.7.4.2.5	The Stage the Proceedings Were At	168
5.7.4.3	Concluding Comments	170
5.7.5	Procedural Factors	170
5.7.6	Concluding Comments	173
5.8	The Waiver Perspective: General Comments	174
5.8.1	Introduction	174
5.8.2	When Procedural Rights Can Be Waived	175
5.8.3	When Proper Notification Has Taken Place	176
5.8.3.1	Introduction	176
5.8.3.2	The Fundamental Requirement: That the National Authorities Have Done What Could Reasonably Be Expected	179
5.8.3.3	Illustrative Judgments and Decisions Regarding the Requirement of Proper Notification	182
5.8.3.3.1	Examples That the Strasbourg Court Finds That the Applicant Had Not Been Properly Notified	182

	5.8.3.3.2	Examples That the Strasbourg Court Finds That the Applicant Had Been Properly Notified	183
	5.8.3.4	General Principles for the Assessment of Whether There Had Been Proper Notification	184
	5.8.3.4.1	The Diligence Expected of the Civil Litigant in This Regard	185
	5.8.3.4.2	The Diligence Expected of the National Authorities in This Regard	187
	5.8.3.5	Concluding Comments	191
	5.8.4	When the Party's Conduct Constitutes a Waiver	192
	5.8.5	Concluding Comments	195
5.9		The Effectiveness Perspective: General Comments	195
	5.9.1	Introduction	195
	5.9.2	Adequate Time and Facilities	197
	5.9.3	A Proper Examination by the Court	199
	5.9.4	Procedural Certainty	203
	5.9.5	Procedural Flexibility	207
	5.9.6	Procedural Guidance	209
	5.9.7	Concluding Comments	210
5.10		Transition to the Discussion of Specific Procedural Issues	210
6		The 'Response' Issue	213
	6.1	The 'Response' Issue: The Proportionality Perspective	213
	6.1.1	Introduction	213
	6.1.2	The Strasbourg Court's General Approach to the 'Response Issue'	214
	6.1.3	The Role of 'Appearances'-Related Factors in the Context of the 'Response' Issue	218
	6.1.3.1	Introductory Comments Concerning the Role of 'Appearances'	218
	6.1.3.2	Examples That the 'with a View to Influencing' Rule Definitely Does Apply, and Definitely Does Not Apply	219
	6.1.3.3	Situations Where the Practical Significance of an Opportunity to Respond, May Be Questioned	220
	6.1.3.3.1	Introductory Comments	220
	6.1.3.3.2	Examples of Judgments Where the Approach Has Been Strict and Formalistic	221

	6.1.3.3.3	How the Strict and Formalistic Approach Relates to 'Appearances'-Related Factors	228
6.1.3.4		Challenges to the Strict and Formalistic Approach to the 'Response' Issue	232
	6.1.3.4.1	Introductory Comments	232
	6.1.3.4.2	Judgments Which Challenge the Strict and Formalistic Approach	232
	6.1.3.4.3	The Main Points of the Critique of the Strict and Formalistic Approach	240
		6.1.3.4.3.1 Whether the Strict and Formalistic Approach Shows Sufficient Respect for Long-Standing National Procedural Traditions	240
		6.1.3.4.3.2 Whether the Strict and Formalistic Approach Amounts to Acknowledging a 'Hypothetical and Illusory' Right	241
		6.1.3.4.3.3 Whether There May Be Gains in Terms of Efficiency and Economy by Allowing for a More Flexible Approach	245
	6.1.3.5	The Outlines of an Alternative Approach	248
6.1.4		The Role of Instrumental Factors in the Context of the 'Response' Issue	250
6.1.5		The Role of Procedural Factors in the Context of the 'Response' Issue	251
6.1.6		A Summary of How the Various Factors Relate to Each Other in the Context of the 'Response' Issue	251
6.1.7		The Distinction Between the 'Response' Issue and the Issue of Disclosure	252

6.1.8	Concluding Comments Concerning the ‘Response’ Issue	256
6.2	The ‘Response’ Issue: The Waiver Perspective	257
6.3	The ‘Response’ Issue: The Effectiveness Perspective	260
6.3.1	Introduction: The Opportunity to Respond Must Be ‘Real and Genuine’	260
6.3.2	Adequate Time to Frame a Response	261
6.3.3	The Party Must Be Given Satisfactory Access to the Submission	262
7	The ‘Oral Hearing’ Issue	265
7.1	The ‘Oral Hearing’ Issue: The Proportionality Perspective	265
7.1.1	Introduction	265
7.1.2	The Strasbourg Court’s Approach to the Relationship Between the Right to a ‘Public Hearing’ and the Right to an ‘Oral Hearing’	268
7.1.3	The Strasbourg Court’s General Approach to the ‘Oral Hearing’ Issue	272
7.1.4	The Role of ‘Appearances’-Related Factors in the Context of the ‘Oral Hearing’ Issue	272
7.1.4.1	How Strict the ‘Exceptional Circumstances’ Criterion Actually Is	272
7.1.4.2	The Strict Approach to the ‘Oral Hearing’ Issue	273
7.1.4.3	The Flexible Approach to the ‘Oral Hearing’ Issue	274
7.1.4.4	The Compromise Approach to the ‘Oral Hearing’ Issue	276
7.1.4.5	An Evaluation of the Different Approaches to the ‘Oral Hearing’ Issue	279
7.1.4.6	Factors of Relevance in the Context of the ‘Oral Hearing’ Issue: Competing Objectives	281
7.1.4.7	Factors of Relevance in the Context of the ‘Oral Hearing’ Issue: The Importance of the Case	281
7.1.5	The Role of Instrumental Factors in the Context of the ‘Oral Hearing’ Issue	282
7.1.5.1	Introductory Comments	282
7.1.5.2	Whether the Proceedings Gave Rise Only to Legal Issues	283
7.1.5.3	Whether the Factual Questions Were Highly Technical	285
7.1.5.4	Other Circumstances of Potential Significance for Whether an Oral Hearing Could Be Dispensed With	289

7.1.5.5	That the Applicant Must Have Been Able to Participate by Other Means	292
7.1.6	The Role of Procedural Factors in the Context of the ‘Oral Hearing’ Issue	293
7.1.7	A Summary of How the Various Factors Relate to Each Other According to the ‘Exceptional Circumstances’ Criterion	296
7.1.8	Whether an Oral Hearing Must Be Held at the Appeal Stage	297
7.1.8.1	The ‘Special Features’ Guideline	297
7.1.8.2	The Various Aspects of the ‘Special Features’ Guideline	299
7.1.8.2.1	Introductory Comments	299
7.1.8.2.2	The Appellate Court’s Review Is Limited in Certain Regards	299
7.1.8.2.3	The Appellate Court Conducts a Full Assessment	303
7.1.8.3	If an Oral Hearing Was Waived Before the Lower Court	307
7.1.9	Concluding Comments Concerning the ‘Oral Hearing’ Issue	307
7.2	The ‘Oral Hearing’ Issue: The Waiver Perspective	309
7.2.1	Introduction	309
7.2.2	When a Waiver Runs Contrary to Important Public Interests	309
7.2.3	When a Waiver Has Been Made in an ‘Unequivocal Manner’	311
7.3	The ‘Oral Hearing’ Issue: The Effectiveness Perspective	316
8	The ‘Personal Participation’ Issue	319
8.1	The ‘Personal Participation’ Issue: The Proportionality Perspective	319
8.1.1	Introduction	319
8.1.2	The Strasbourg Court’s General Approach to the ‘Personal Participation’ Issue	320
8.1.3	The Role of ‘Appearances’-Related Factors in the Context of the ‘Personal Participation’ Issue	322
8.1.4	The Role of Instrumental Factors in the Context of the ‘Personal Participation’ Issue	325
8.1.5	The Role of Procedural Factors in the Context of the ‘Personal Participation’ Issue	329
8.1.6	A Summary of How the Various Factors Relate to Each Other in the Context of the ‘Personal Participation’ Issue	330

8.1.7	When There Is a Right To Be Present and Participate in Person at an Appeal Hearing	331
8.1.8	Concluding Comments Concerning the ‘Personal Participation’ Issue	332
8.2	The ‘Personal Participation’ Issue: The Waiver Perspective . . .	333
8.3	The ‘Personal Participation’ Issue: The Effectiveness Perspective	336
9	The ‘Evidence’ Issue	337
9.1	The ‘Evidence’ Issue: The Proportionality Perspective	337
9.1.1	Introduction	337
9.1.2	The Strasbourg Court’s General Approach to the ‘Evidence’ Issue	338
9.1.2.1	That the Strasbourg Court Has Shown Restraint in This Regard	338
9.1.2.2	That the Refusal of an Evidentiary Request May Be of Relevance to the Overall Fairness Assessment	339
9.1.2.3	That a Refusal of Evidence May Constitute a Violation of the Fairness Standard in ‘Exceptional Circumstances’	340
9.1.3	The Role of ‘Appearances’-Related Factors in the Context of the ‘Evidence’ Issue	347
9.1.3.1	When the Refusal of Evidence Affects the Essence of the Party’s Right to Participate Properly	347
9.1.3.1.1	Introductory Comments	347
9.1.3.1.2	If the Applicant Could Present Little or No Evidence During the National Court Proceedings	348
9.1.3.1.3	If the Parties Were Apparently Treated Differently as Regards the Opportunity to Adduce Evidence	348
9.1.3.2	Factors of Relevance in the Context of the ‘Evidence’ Issue: Competing Objectives	352
9.1.3.3	Factors of Relevance in the Context of the ‘Evidence’ Issue: The Importance of the Case	353
9.1.4	The Role of Instrumental Factors in the Context of the ‘Evidence’ Issue	353
9.1.4.1	Introductory Comments	353

9.1.4.2	The National Court's Latitude to Work Out Its Own Understanding of the Concept of Relevance	354
9.1.4.2.1	Arguments Against the Hypothesis Concerning How the Concept of Relevance Is To Be Understood	355
9.1.4.2.2	Arguments in Favour of the Hypothesis Concerning How the Concept of Relevance Is To Be Understood	357
9.1.4.3	That the Strasbourg Court Should Set Out General Principles Concerning the Understanding of the Concept of Relevance	360
9.1.4.4	Examples That the Refusal of Evidence Impaired the Fairness of the Proceedings	362
9.1.4.4.1	<i>De Haes and Gijssels v. Belgium</i>	362
9.1.4.4.2	<i>Georgios Papageorgiou v. Greece</i>	363
9.1.4.4.3	<i>Van Kück v. Germany</i>	363
9.1.4.4.4	<i>Stoimenov v. The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia</i>	365
9.1.4.4.5	<i>Bochan v. Ukraine</i>	366
9.1.4.4.6	<i>Olujic v. Croatia</i>	366
9.1.4.4.7	<i>Gryaznov v. Russia</i>	367
9.1.4.5	An Overview of Factors of Particular Relevance to the Assessment of Whether There Are 'Exceptional Circumstances'	368
9.1.5	The Role of Procedural Factors in the Context of the 'Evidence' Issue	373
9.1.5.1	That the Party May Be Required to Provide an Explanation	373
9.1.5.2	Whether the National Court Has Let the Parties State Their Views, and Given an Explicit Reply and a Reasoned Decision	373
9.1.5.3	Whether the Lack of an Explicit Reply or a Reasoned Decision Automatically Renders the Proceedings as a Whole Unfair	378
9.1.6	A Summary of How the Various Factors Relate to Each Other in the Context of the 'Evidence' Issue	381

9.1.7	The Distinction Between the 'Evidence' Issue and the Issue of Preliminary Rulings	382
9.1.8	Concluding Comments Concerning the 'Evidence' Issue	384
9.2	The 'Evidence' Issue: The Waiver Perspective	386
9.3	The 'Evidence' Issue: The Effectiveness Perspective	388
9.3.1	Introduction	388
9.3.2	The Opportunity to Present Evidence Must Be Real and Genuine	388
9.3.3	Preparation and Presentation of Expert Evidence	390
10	The 'Legal Aid' Issue	395
10.1	The 'Legal Aid' Issue: The Proportionality Perspective	395
10.1.1	Introduction	395
10.1.2	The Strasbourg Court's General Approach to the 'Legal Aid' Issue	396
10.1.3	The Role of 'Appearances'-Related Factors in the Context of the 'Legal Aid' Issue	403
10.1.3.1	That the Lack of Legal Aid May, in Certain Circumstances, Make the Proceedings Appear Unfair to a Certain Extent	403
10.1.3.1.1	If There Are Formal Conditions for Being Eligible for Legal Aid	403
10.1.3.1.1.1	Whether Financial Conditions May Be Imposed	404
10.1.3.1.1.2	Whether Legal Persons Must Be Eligible for Legal Aid	405
10.1.3.1.1.3	Whether Legal Aid May Be Excluded for Specific Categories of Civil Proceedings	408
10.1.3.1.2	If There Is Great Inequality Between the Parties	409
10.1.3.2	Factors of Relevance in the Context of the 'Legal Aid' Issue: Competing Objectives	410
10.1.3.3	Factors of Relevance in the Context of the 'Legal Aid' Issue: The Importance of the Case	410

10.1.4	The Role of Instrumental Factors in the Context of the 'Legal Aid' Issue	411
10.1.4.1	Introductory Comments	411
10.1.4.2	The Complexity of the Relevant Law and Procedure	412
10.1.4.3	The Applicant's Capacity to Anyway Participate Effectively	416
10.1.4.3.1	The Extent of Emotional Involvement	416
10.1.4.3.2	The Applicant's Personal Resourcefulness	417
10.1.4.4	Whether There Were Alternative Opportunities for Obtaining Legal Assistance	418
10.1.4.5	How Well-Founded the Applicant's Case Appeared To Be	421
10.1.5	The Role of Procedural Factors in the Context of the 'Legal Aid' Issue	425
10.1.6	A Summary of How the Various Factors Relate to Each Other in the Context of the 'Legal Aid' Issue	427
10.1.7	If Legal Representation Is Compulsory	428
10.1.8	Concluding Comments Concerning the 'Legal Aid' Issue	431
10.2	The 'Legal Aid' Issue: The Waiver Perspective	432
10.3	The 'Legal Aid' Issue: The Effectiveness Perspective	433
10.3.1	Introduction	433
10.3.2	Requirements as to the Effectiveness of Legal Aid in the Civil Context	436
10.3.3	When a Failure on the Part of the Lawyer Has Been Remedied by the National Legal System	440
11	Conclusion	443
11.1	A Summary of the Main Findings	443
11.1.1	The Strasbourg Court as a Guardian of the Fairness of Civil Proceedings	443
11.1.2	The General Perspectives	445
11.1.3	The 'Response' Issue	446
11.1.4	The 'Oral Hearing' Issue	447
11.1.5	The 'Personal Participation' Issue	448
11.1.6	The 'Evidence' Issue	450
11.1.7	The 'Legal Aid' Issue	451
11.2	A Few Remarks on the Role of ECHR Article 35(3)(b) in Relation to ECHR Article 6	452
11.3	A Few Remarks as Regards the Call for a Greater Emphasis on Subsidiarity	457
11.4	Final Words	461

Appendix	463
Table of Cases	463
International Treaties and Declarations, Other International Documents, National Legislation	503
Bibliography	507