EUROPEAN COURT OF HUMAN RIGHTS
COUR EUROPÉENNE DES DROITS DE L'HOMME

Press Unit
Unité de la Presse

Press country profile
Fiche pays pour la presse

Last updated: July 2026

The United Kingdom

Ratified the European Convention on Human Rights in 1951

National Judge: Hugh Mercer (22 septembre 2025 -)

Judges' CVs are available on the ECtHR Internet site

Previous Judges: Lord (Arnold Duncan) McNair (1959-1966), Sir Humphrey Waldock (1966-1974), Sir Gerald Fitzmaurice (1974-1980), Sir Vincent Evans (1980-1990), Sir John Freeland (1991-1998), Sir Nicolas Bratza (1998-2012), Paul Mahoney (2012-2016), Tim Eicke (2016-2025)

Liste des juges à la Cour depuis 1959

The Court dealt with 397 applications concerning the United Kingdom in 2025, 385 of which were declared inadmissible or struck out. It delivered 10 judgments (concerning 12 applications), 4 of which found at least one violation of the European Convention on Human Rights.

Applications processed in	2024	2025	2026*
Applications allocated to a judicial formation	478	260	164
Communicated to the Government	5	9	5
Applications decided:	332	397	127
- Declared inadmissible or struck out (Single Judge)	188	371	115
- Declared inadmissible or struck out (Committee)	137	8	11
- Declared inadmissible or struck out (Chamber)	3	6	0
- Decided by judgment	4	12	1

* January to July 2026
For information about the Court's judicial formations and procedure, see the ECtHR internet site.
Statistics on interim measures can be found here.

Applications pending before the court on 01/07/2026	
Applications pending before a judicial formation:	174
Single Judge	63
Committee (3 Judges)	44
Chamber (7 Judges)	67
Grand Chamber (17 Judges)	0

The United Kingdom and ...

The Registry

The task of the Registry is to provide legal and administrative support to the Court in the exercise of its judicial functions. It is composed of lawyers, administrative and technical staff and translators. There are currently **673** Registry staff members.

Press and media

Associated Newspapers Limited v. the United Kingdom

12.11.2024

The case concerned the fact that Associated Newspapers Limited - the publisher of the Daily Mail and the Mail on Sunday - had been obliged to pay extensive costs incurred by claimants who had successfully sued it in privacy and/or defamation proceedings following articles it had published in print or online in 2017 and 2019. Since one of the claimants had entered into a conditional fee arrangement (CFA) with his legal representative, and both had taken out "after-the-event" (ATE) insurance, Associated Newspapers Limited had been liable not only for their base costs, but also for fee uplifts including the "success fee" in the CFA and for their ATE insurance premiums.

Violation of Article 10 as regards the "success fees" the newspaper company had had to pay

No violation of Article 10 as regards the company's obligation to cover the "after-the event" (ATE) insurance premiums taken out by the successful claimants

Animal Defenders International v. the UK

22.04.2013

The case concerned the complaint by a non-governmental organisation that it had been denied the possibility to advertise on TV or radio.

No violation of Article 10 (freedom of expression)

Overall, the Court found that the reasons given to justify the ban on paid political advertising were convincing and that it did not therefore go too far in restricting the right to participate in public debate.

Mosley v. the UK

10.05.2011

Concerned the publication of articles, images and video footage in the News of the World newspaper and on its website which disclosed details of the applicant's sexual activities. Mr Mosley complained about the authorities' failure to impose a legal duty on the newspaper to notify him in advance of further publication of the material so that he could seek an interim injunction

No violation of Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life) - media are not required to give prior notice of intended publications to those who feature in them

MGN Limited v. the UK

18.01.2011

Mgn Limited, publisher of the Daily Mirror, complained about the UK courts finding that it had breached Naomi Campbell's privacy by publishing articles and pictures about her drug-addiction treatment and about the requirement to pay excessive success fees agreed between Ms Campbell and her lawyers

No violation of Article 10 (freedom of expression) as regards private life complaint

Violation of Article 10 as regards the success fees

MacKay & BBC Scotland v. the UK

07.12.2010

Concerned complaint by a retired journalist and the BBC about not being able to challenge a court order prohibiting reporting on a criminal trial

Violation of Article 13 (right to an effective remedy) in conjunction with Article 10 (freedom of expression)

Financial Times Ltd and Others v. the UK

15.12.2009

Five news organisations complained about a court order requiring them to deliver up documents which could have led to the identification of a journalistic source.

Violation of Article 10 (freedom of expression)

Times Newspapers Ltd v. the UK (nos. 1 & 2)

10.03.2009

Complaint about a rule under UK law whereby each time an article is accessed in electronic archives, a new cause of action in defamation arises.

No violation of Article 10 (freedom of expression)

Goodwin v. the UK

27.03.1996

Complaint by a journalist ordered to disclose the source of information he had

received regarding a company's confidential corporate plan and fined for contempt of court for refusing to do so.
Violation of Article 10 (freedom of expression)

Observer and Guardian v. the UK

26.11.1991
Complaint about an injunction imposed on two newspapers regarding the publication of details of the book 'Spycatcher' and information obtained from its author, a former a senior member of the British Security Service.
Violation of Article 10 (freedom of expression)

Sunday Times (No. 1) v. the UK

26.04.1979
An injunction was imposed on the Sunday Times preventing publication of an article dealing with thalidomide children and the settlement of their compensation claims.
Violation of Article 10 (freedom of expression)

Freedom of religion

Eweida and Others v. the UK

15.01.2013
The case concerned four practising Christians. Ms Eweida, a British Airways employee, and Ms Chaplin, a geriatrics nurse, complained that their employers placed restrictions on their visibly wearing Christian crosses around their necks while at work. Ms Ladele, a Registrar of Births, Deaths and Marriages, and Mr McFarlane, a Relate counsellor complained about their dismissal for refusing to carry out certain of their duties which they considered would condone homosexuality.
Violation of Article 9 (freedom of religion) as concerned Ms Eweida
No violation of Article 9, taken alone or in conjunction with Article 14 (prohibition of discrimination), as concerned Ms Chaplin and Mr McFarlane
No violation of Article 14 taken in conjunction with Article 9 as concerned Ms Ladele

British armed forces in Iraq

Miller v. the UK

25.07.2019 (decision on the admissibility)
The case concerned the applicant's complaint under Article 2 (right to life) that the UK authorities had failed to carry out an effective investigation into the killing of his son, Corporal Simon Miller, and other members of the Royal Military Police (RMP) in Iraq in 2003.
Application declared inadmissible.

Hassan v. the UK

16.09.2014
The case concerned the capture of an Iraqi national, Tarek Hassan, by the British armed forces and his detention at Camp Bucca in southeastern Iraq during the hostilities in 2003. His brother claims that Tarek was under the control of British forces, and that his dead body was subsequently found bearing marks of torture and execution.
The Court held that Tarek Hassan had been within the jurisdiction of the United Kingdom between the time of his arrest by British troops, in April 2003, until his release from the bus that had taken him from Camp Bucca under military escort to a drop-off point, in May 2003 but that there had been no violation of Article 5 §§ 1, 2, 3 or 4 (right to liberty and security) as concerned the actual capture and detention of Tarek Hassan.
The Court further declared inadmissible for lack of evidence the complaints under Article 2 (right to life) and 3 (prohibition of inhuman or degrading treatment) concerning the alleged ill-treatment and death of Tarek Hassan.

Pritchard v. the UK

18.03.2014
Concerned the death during an ambush of a UK soldier serving in Iraq and the questions whether the Convention applied and whether there should have been a full investigation into the circumstances of the death.
Case struck out of the Court's list of cases following a friendly settlement decision.

Al-Skeini and Others v. the UK

07.07.2011 (Grand Chamber judgment)
Concerned the killing of Iraqi civilians by the UK armed forces in Southern Iraq and raised issues of extra-territorial jurisdiction.

The Court found that the UK had jurisdiction under Article 1 (obligation to respect human rights), in the exceptional circumstances deriving from its assumption of authority for the maintenance of security in South East Iraq, in respect of civilians killed during security operations carried out by UK soldiers in Basrah and that there had been a violation of Article 2 (right to life) concerning the failure to carry out an effective investigation into the deaths of five of the six applicants' relatives

Al-Jedda v. the UK

07.07.2011 (Grand Chamber judgment)

Concerned the internment of an Iraqi civilian for over three years in a United Kingdom detention centre in Basrah.

Violation of Article 5 § 1 (right to liberty and security)

Al-Saadoon and Mufdhi v. the UK

02.03.2010

The case concerned the complaint by the applicants, accused of involvement in the murder of two British soldiers shortly after the invasion of Iraq in 2003, that their transfer by the British authorities into Iraqi custody put them at real risk of execution by hanging.

Violation of Article 3 (prohibition of inhuman or degrading treatment)

Violation of Articles 13 (right to an effective remedy) and 34 (right to individual petition)

Pensions, taxation, benefits

Pending case

L.T. v. the UK (8786/20) and five other applications

The case concerns the Government's policy of providing thirty hours per week of free childcare to three-year old and four-year-old children of working parents but only fifteen hours per week of free childcare to those of that age of non-working parents.

J.D. and A v. the UK (nos. 32949/17 and 34614/17)

24.10.2019

The case concerned the applicants' complaint that new rules on housing benefit in the social housing sector (informally known as "the bedroom tax") discriminated against them because of their particular situations: the first applicant cares for a disabled daughter while the second is a victim of domestic violence. Both live in specially adapted homes.

No violation of Article 14 (prohibition of discrimination) in conjunction with Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 (protecti on of property) in respect of the first applicant

Violation of Article 14 in conjunction with Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 in respect of the second applicant

British Gurkha Welfare Society and Others v. the UK

15.09.2016

The case concerned Gurkha soldiers' pensions. Historically, the Gurkhas had been governed by a different pension scheme from other soldiers in the British Army, with different terms and conditions. However, following changes to their situation, including the relocation of their home base to the UK on 1 July 1997, the UK decided to bring their pensions into line with those of other soldiers in the British Army. In 2007 they offered to transfer the pensions of Gurkha soldiers who retired on or after 1 July 1997 from the Gurkha pension scheme to the regular Armed Forces Pension Scheme. The terms of transfer allowed only the transfer of pension rights accrued after 1 July 1997 on a year-for-year basis.

No violation of Article 14 (prohibition of discrimination) read together with Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 (protection of property)

Fazia Ali v. the UK

20.10.2015

The case concerned the legislative scheme in the United Kingdom under which local authorities have a duty to provide housing to the homeless.

No violation of Article 6 § 1 (right to a fair hearing/access to court)

S.S. v. the UK and F.A. and Others v. the UK (nos. 40356/10 and 54460/10)

21.04.2015

The case concerned five convicted prisoners' entitlement to social security benefits whilst serving criminal sentences in psychiatric hospitals. New regulations were introduced in 2006 to ensure that prisoners in psychiatric hospitals did not receive social security benefits, available to other patients, until the date they would be

entitled to release from prison. Relying on Article 14 (prohibition of discrimination) of the Convention, the applicants notably complained that denying them the social security benefits paid to all other patients in psychiatric hospitals had amounted to unjustified discrimination.
Applications declared inadmissible

McDonald v. the UK

20.05.2014
The case concerned a lady with severely limited mobility who complained about a reduction by a local authority of the amount allocated for her weekly care. The reduction was based on the local authority's decision that her night-time toileting needs could be met by the provision of incontinence pads and absorbent sheets instead of a night-time carer to assist her in using a commode.
-there had been a violation of Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life) in respect of the period between 21 November 2008 and 4 November 2009 because the interference with her rights had not been in accordance with domestic law during this period; but
-the complaint concerning the period after 4 November 2009 was inadmissible as manifestly ill-founded because the State had considerable discretion when it came to decisions concerning the allocation of scarce resources and, as such, the interference with Ms McDonald's rights had been "necessary in a democratic society".

Bah v. the UK

27.09.2011
Concerned a complaint by a national of Sierra Leone that her 13-year-old son, who had been granted leave to join her in the UK on the condition that he did not have recourse to public funds, could not be taken into account when assessing whether she was in priority need for council housing
No violation of Article 14 (prohibition of discrimination) in conjunction with Article 8 (right to respect for family life)

Carson and Others v. the UK

16.03.2010 (Grand Chamber judgment)
Concerned failure of UK authorities to index-link pensions of former British residents who had moved to countries which had not signed a bi-lateral agreement with UK.
No violation of Article 14 (prohibition of discrimination) in conjunction with Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 (protection of property)

Burden v. the UK

29.04.2008 (Grand Chamber judgment)
Concerned unmarried co-habiting sisters' complaint that, when one of them dies, the survivor would face heavy inheritance tax bill, unlike the survivor of a marriage or a civil partnership.
No violation of Article 14 (prohibition of discrimination) taken in conjunction with Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 (protection of property)

Asylum/migration

Khaksar v. the UK

26.04.2018 (decision on the admissibility)
The application concerned an Afghan asylum seeker's complaint about his threatened removal to Afghanistan. Mr Khaksar, the applicant, argued that his removal would breach Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life) and Article 3 (prohibition of inhuman or degrading treatment) of the Convention, in view of his serious health issues following a bomb blast in Afghanistan.
The application was declared inadmissible for non-exhaustion of national remedies.

Ahmed v. the UK

02.03.2017
The case concerned the applicant's detention after the Secretary of State decided to make a deportation order against him.
No violation of Article 5 § 1 f) (right to liberty and security)
No violation of Article 34 (individual applications)

J.N. v. the UK (no. 37289/12)

19.05.2016
The case concerned a complaint about the system of immigration detention in the United Kingdom.
Violation of Article 5 § 1 (right to liberty and security) in respect of the period of detention from mid-2008 to 14 September 2009

I.A.A. and Others v. the UK
(no. 25960/13)
31.03.2016
The case concerned the complaint by five Somali nationals, the applicants, about the UK authorities' refusal to grant them entry into the United Kingdom to be reunited with their mother. The applicants' mother had joined her second husband in the UK in 2004 and the applicants were left in the care of their mother's sister in Somalia. They moved in 2006 to Ethiopia where the applicants have been living ever since.
Application declared inadmissible.

H. and B. v. the UK (nos. 70073/10 and 44539/11)
09.04.2013
The case concerned two Afghan nationals' allegation that, if removed to their country of origin, they would be at risk of ill-treatment from the Taliban in reprisal for their past work for the United Nations as a driver and the United States forces as an interpreter, respectively.
No violation of Article 3 (prohibition of inhuman and degrading treatment) if either Mr H. or Mr B., failed asylum seekers, were removed to Afghanistan

S.H.H. v. the UK (no. 60367/10)
29.01.2013
Concerned allegation by failed asylum seeker that his removal to Afghanistan would amount to ill-treatment, especially due to his vulnerability as a disabled amputee
There would be no violation of Article 3 (prohibition of inhuman or degrading treatment) if Mr S.H.H. were removed to Afghanistan
The Court noted in particular that Article 3 did not oblige a Contracting State to provide all immigrants with free and unlimited health care. It held that the responsibility of Contracting States under Article 3 could only be engaged in very exceptional cases of general violence where the humanitarian grounds against removal were compelling, which the applicant had failed to prove in his case.

Hode & Abdi v. the UK
06.11.2012
Concerned the refusal to grant a refugee's wife leave to enter the United Kingdom. Although Mr Hode was a refugee, the applicants did not qualify for "family reunion" under the Immigration Rules because the marriage had taken place after he left Somalia. Moreover, as Mr Hode had only been granted five years' Leave to Remain, Mrs Abdi could not join him as the spouse of a person present and settled in the United Kingdom.
Violation of Article 14 (prohibition of discrimination) in conjunction with Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life)

Sufi and Elmi v. the UK
28.06.2011
Concerned the involuntary removal of two Somali nationals to Mogadishu. On arrival in Mogadishu they would have had to travel to their home areas through regions under the control of al-Shabaab, where an extreme version of Sharia law was being enforced. In addition, there was a real risk that they would end up living in overcrowded refugee or IDP camps.
Violation of Article 3 (prohibition of torture and ill treatment)

O'Donoghue and Others v. the UK
14.12.2010
Requirement that immigrants wishing to marry outside Church of England obtain the permission of the Home Secretary
Violation of Article 14 (prohibition of discrimination) read together with Articles 9 (freedom of religion) and 12 (right to marry)

N. v. the UK (no. 26565/05)
27.05.2008 (Grand Chamber judgment)
Concerned failed asylum seeker suffering from HIV who was to be returned to Uganda where she would not receive same standard of medical treatment as in UK.
No violation of Article 3 (prohibition of torture and/or inhuman and degrading treatment)

Saadi v. the UK
29.01.2008 (Grand Chamber judgment)
Detention of asylum-seeker while his asylum claim was considered.
No violation of Article 5 § 1 (right to liberty and security)
Violation of Article 5 § 2 (right to be informed of reasons for detention)

Terrorism and national security

Pending case

Amin and Ahmed v. the UK
(nos. 6610/09 and 326/12)
The applicants were arrested and detained in Pakistan in 2004 before being deported to the United Kingdom, where they were tried and convicted of involvement in terrorism. The applicants complain that the Pakistani authorities tortured them in detention and that British agents were complicit in these acts, knowing that the applicants were being tortured. They also complain about the unfairness of the subsequent criminal proceedings in the United Kingdom as at the trial certain materials were withheld from the defence on ground of public interest immunity.
They rely on Article 3 (prohibition of torture, of inhuman or degrading treatment and lack of effective investigation) and Article 6 § 1 (right to a fair trial).

Beghal v. the UK
28.02.2019
The case concerned the use of counter-terrorism legislation giving immigration officers the power to stop, search and question passengers at ports, airports and international rail terminals. The applicant, Sylvie Beghal, had been stopped and questioned at East Midlands Airport in 2011.
Violation of Article 8

Gulamhussein and Tariq v. the UK
26.04.2018 (decision on the admissibility)
The case concerned the withdrawal of the applicants' security clearances on the grounds of their being associated with terrorism, leading to their dismissal from their jobs as civil servants.
Case declared inadmissible.
The Court found that even though some of the proceedings had been held in "closed" session because they referred to classified information, the applicants had been provided with proper safeguards for their rights to a fair trial, including by being provided with special advocates who could attend those closed hearings.

K2 v. the UK (no. 42387/13)
09.03.2017 (decision on the admissibility)
The applicant in this application, K2, was suspected of taking part in terrorism-related activities in Somalia. In 2010, the Secretary of State for the Home Office deprived him of his UK citizenship and barred him from re-entering the country.
K2 claimed that these decisions had violated his right to respect for private and family life under Article 8 (right to private and family life), and had been discriminatory.
Application declared inadmissible

Malik v. the UK
30.06.2016
The case concerned Mr Malik's complaint about his detention, questioning and search at London Heathrow airport under anti-terrorism legislation.
Case struck out of the Court's list of cases

A. and Others v. the UK (no. 3455/05)
19.02.2009 (Grand Chamber judgment)
Concerned detention of foreign nationals suspected of terrorism who could not be deported due to risk of ill-treatment in their countries of origin.
No violation of Article 3 (prohibition of torture and/or inhuman and degrading treatment)
Violation of Article 5 §§ 1, 4 and 5 (right to liberty and security)

Terrorism and defence rights

Ibrahim and Others v. the UK
13.09.2016
On 21 July 2005 four bombs were detonated on the London transport system but failed to explode. The perpetrators fled the scene. The first three applicants, Mr Ibrahim, Mr Mohammed and Mr Omar, were later arrested on suspicion of having detonated three of the bombs. They were questioned by the police in urgent "safety interviews" before having had access to legal advice. They were subsequently convicted of conspiracy to murder. They complained before the Court about the temporary delay in providing them with access to a lawyer and the admission at their subsequent trials of statements made in the absence of lawyers.

No violation of Article 6 §§ 1 and 3 (c) (right to a fair trial and right to legal assistance) in respect of three applicants (Mr Ibrahim, Mr Mohammed and Mr Omar) and violation of Article 6 §§ 1 and 3 (c) in respect of the fourth applicant, Mr Abdurahman

Sher and Others v. the UK

20.10.2015

The case concerned the arrest and detention of three Pakistani nationals, the applicants, in the context of a counterterrorism operation.

No violation of Article 5 § 4 (right to take proceedings to challenge lawfulness of detention)

No violation of Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life)

Abdulla Ali v. the UK

30.06.2015

The case concerned Mr Ali's complaint that, because of extensive adverse media coverage, the criminal proceedings against him for conspiring in a terrorist plot to cause explosions on aircraft using liquid bombs had been unfair.

No violation of Article 6 § 1 (right to a fair trial)

Extradition

Aswat v. the UK (no. 62176/14)

29.01.2015

The case dealt with a further application by Mr Aswat, who complained about the inadequacy of the assurances provided by the Government of the United States with regard to his extradition from the United Kingdom to the United States.

In light of the specific assurances and additional information received from the United States' government, and the careful examination of the case by the High Court in the United Kingdom, the ECtHR found that it could not be said that there was a real risk that Mr Aswat would be subjected to treatment contrary to Article 3 if extradited.

The Court therefore declared the application inadmissible.

Aswat v. the UK (no. 17299/12)

16.04.2013

The case concerned the complaint by Mr Aswat, a terrorist suspect who was detained in the United Kingdom, that his extradition to the United States of America would amount to ill-treatment, in particular because the detention conditions (a potentially long period of pre-trial detention and his possible placement in a "supermax" prison) were likely to exacerbate his condition of paranoid schizophrenia.

While the Court held that Mr Aswat's extradition to the USA would be in violation of Article 3 (prohibition of inhuman and degrading treatment), it was solely on account of the severity of his mental illness and not as a result of the length of his possible detention there.

Babar Ahmad and Others v. the UK

06.04.2012

Concerned six alleged international terrorists – Babar Ahmad, Haroon Rashid Aswat, Syed Tahla Ahsan, Mustafa Kamal Mustafa (known more commonly as Abu Hamza), Adel Abdul Bary and Khaled Al-Fawwaz – who have been detained in the United Kingdom pending extradition to the United States of America.

- **No violation of Article 3** (prohibition of inhuman and degrading treatment) as a result of **conditions of detention** at ADX Florence (a "supermax" prison in the United States) – if Mr Ahmad, Mr Ahsan, Mr Abu Hamza, Mr Bary and Mr Al-Fawwaz were extradited to the USA

- **No violation of Article 3** as a result of the **length of their possible sentences** if Mr Ahmad, Mr Ahsan, Abu Hamza, Mr Bary and Mr Al-Fawwaz were extradited.

- Examination of **Mr Aswat's application adjourned** as further submissions required from the parties, on the relevance of his schizophrenia and detention at Broadmoor Hospital to his complaint concerning detention at ADX. See Aswat v. the UK above.

Omar Othman v. the UK

17.01.2012

The applicant, Omar Othman (also known as Abu Qatada), challenged his removal to Jordan where he had been convicted in his absence on various terrorism charges.

The Court found that the diplomatic assurances obtained by the UK Government from the Jordanian Government were sufficient to protect Mr Othman and that there would therefore be no risk of ill-treatment, and no violation of Article 3 (prohibition of inhuman and degrading

treatment), if Mr Othman were deported to Jordan. The Court found, however, that there would be a violation of Article 6 (right to a fair trial), given the real risk of the admission of evidence obtained by torture at his retrial. It was the **first time that the Court found that an expulsion would be in violation of Article 6**, which reflected the international consensus that the use of evidence obtained through torture made a fair trial impossible.

Deportation / expulsion

Otite v. the UK

27.09.2022

The case concerned a Nigerian national being served in October 2015 with notice of his liability to deportation, despite having been granted Indefinite Leave to Remain in the UK in 2004.

No violation of Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life) if the applicant were deported from the United Kingdom to Nigeria

Ndidi v. the UK

14.09.2017

The case concerned a Nigerian national's complaint about his deportation from the United Kingdom. Mr Ndidi arrived with his mother in the UK aged two. He had an escalating history of offending from the age of 12, with periods spent in institutions for young offenders. He was released in March 2011, aged 24, and served with a deportation order. All his appeals were unsuccessful. He is currently awaiting deportation, pending an application to the Nigerian authorities for a valid travel document.

No violation of Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life)

Chagos Islanders v. the UK

11.12.2012

Concerned the expulsion of the Chagos islanders from their homes from 1967 to 1973 in order to set up an American military base.

The applicants complained about their removal from the islands (the decision-making process behind it as well as the manner in which it was carried out), the reception conditions on their arrival in Mauritius and the Seychelles, the prohibition on their return, the refusal to facilitate return once the prohibition had been lifted and the refusal to compensate them. They relied on Articles 3 (prohibition on inhuman and degrading treatment), 6 (right to a fair trial / right of access to court), 8 (right to respect for private life, family and home), 13 (right to an effective remedy) and Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 (protection of property).

Application declared inadmissible

Life sentences

Sanchez-Sanchez v. the UK

03.11.2022 (Grand Chamber judgment)

The case concerned the requested extradition of Mr Sanchez-Sanchez, a Mexican national, to the United States of America (USA) to face trial for drug dealing and trafficking, where he alleged that there was a possibility that he might, if convicted, be sentenced to life imprisonment without parole.

No violation of Article 3 (prohibition of inhuman or degrading treatment) if Mr Sanchez-Sanchez were to be extradited

Harkins v. the UK

10.07.2017 (Grand Chamber decision)

The case concerned the extradition of a British national to the United States of America (USA) to face trial for first-degree murder.

Mr Harkins complained that his extradition to the USA would violate Articles 3 (inhuman or degrading treatment) and 6 (right to a fair trial) of the European Convention, because if convicted in Florida he would face a mandatory sentence of life in prison without the possibility of parole.

In its decision in the case, the Court declared both complaints inadmissible. The Court also decided that the interim measure (under Rule 39 of the Rules of Court) indicating to the UK Government that it should stay Mr Harkins' extradition was to be lifted.

This was the second time Mr Harkins applied to the European Court with regard to his extradition.

In 2012, in the judgment *Harkins and Edwards v. the United Kingdom*, the Court found that his extradition would not violate Article 3 of the European Convention. However, Mr Harkins was not extradited and following the subsequent ECtHR

judgments in *Vinter and Others v. the UK* and *Trabelsi v. Belgium* he argued before the national courts that developments in the Court's Article 3 case-law on life sentences without the possibility of parole were such as to require the re-opening of the proceedings. The UK courts refused to re-open the proceedings and, in this second application to the Court, Mr Harkins, relying on the Court's recent case-law, once again complained that his extradition would breach his rights under Article 3 of the Convention.

Hutchinson v. the UK

17.01.2017 (Grand Chamber judgment)

The case concerned the complaint by a man serving a whole life sentence for the murder of three members of a family and the rape of another that his sentence amounted to inhuman and degrading treatment as he had no hope of release.

No violation of Article 3 (prohibition of inhuman or degrading treatment)

Vinter and Others v. the UK

09.07.2013 (Grand Chamber judgment)

The case concerned three applicants' complaint that their imprisonment for life amounted to inhuman and degrading treatment as they had no hope of release.

Violation of Article 3 (prohibition of inhuman and degrading treatment)

The Court found in particular that, for a life sentence to remain compatible with Article 3, there had to be both a possibility of release and a possibility of review. It noted that there was clear support in European and international law and practice for those principles, with the large majority of Convention States not actually imposing life sentences at all or, if they did, providing for a review of life sentences after a set period (usually 25 years' imprisonment).

Criminal justice

Pending cases

A.W. v. the UK (no. 51861/13)
H.A. v. the UK (no. 8723/20)

These cases concern disclosure of criminal record information. The applicants in these cases were either convicted of criminal offences or charged with an offence and subsequently acquitted. They essentially bring complaints under Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life) about the legislation governing rehabilitation of offenders and the disclosure of criminal record information, including the impact on their employment prospects.

Nealon and Hallam v. the United Kingdom

11.06.2024 (Grand Chamber judgment)

The case concerned the rejection of the applicants' claims for compensation for a miscarriage of justice after their convictions had been quashed when new evidence had undermined the cases against them.

No violation of Article 6 § 2 (presumption of innocence)

Yam v. the UK

16.01.2020

In 2008 the applicant was convicted of murder following a public trial in which part of his defence was held *in camera*. The *in camera* decision was based on national security considerations and on the need to protect the identity of another person.

Mr Yam complained mainly under Article 6 that his trial was unfair for several reasons, principally the lack of a public hearing.

No violation of Article 6 §§ 1 and 3 (d) (right to a fair trial and right to obtain attendance and examination of witnesses) on account of the courts' decision to hold part of the applicant's trial for murder in camera

The Court also held that the UK had not failed to comply with its obligations under Article 34 (right to individual petition).

Other complaints were declared inadmissible

O'Neill v. UK

31.01.2019 (decision on the admissibility)

The case concerned Charles Bernard O'Neill, who was convicted in 2010 of murder and several sexual assaults against vulnerable boys. He complained that the part of his trial which related to the sexual offences against children had not respected his right to be presumed innocent.

Application declared inadmissible

Dallas v. the UK

11.02.2016

The case concerned Ms Dallas' conviction for contempt of court as a result of her conducting Internet research in relation to the criminal case she was trying as a juror. Ms Dallas complained that the common law

offence of contempt of court had not been sufficiently clear.
No violation of Article 7 (no punishment without law)

Seton v. the UK

31.03.2016
The case concerned the complaint of a criminal convict about the admission of evidence of an absent witness at his trial.
No violation of Article 6 § 1 in conjunction with Article 6 § 3 (d) (right to a fair trial and right to obtain attendance and examination of witnesses)

Gough v. the UK

28.10.2014
The case concerned in particular Mr Gough's complaint about his repeated arrest, prosecution, conviction and imprisonment in Scotland for breach of the peace because of his nudity in public places.
No violation of Article 8 (right to respect for private life)
No violation of Article 10 (freedom of expression)

Allen v. the UK

12.07.2013 (Grand Chamber judgment)
Refusal to grant compensation to a mother acquitted of the manslaughter of her four-month old son, following the quashing of her conviction.
No violation of Article 6 § 2 (presumption of innocence)

Betteridge v. the UK

29.01.2013
Concerned delays in a case being heard by the Parole Board.
Violation of Article 5 § 4 (right to have lawfulness of detention decided speedily by a court)

James, Wells and Lee v. the UK

18.09.2012
The applicants, prisoners sentenced to indeterminate sentences for the public protection (IPP sentences), complained about the failure of the Secretary of State to ensure the availability of courses in prison aimed at allowing them to address their offending behaviour.
Violation of Article 5 § 1 (right to liberty and security) concerning the applicants' detention following the expiry of their tariff periods and until steps had been taken to progress them through the prison system with a view to their access to appropriate rehabilitative courses
No violation of Article 5 § 4 (right to have lawfulness of detention decided speedily by a court) concerning Mr Wells' and Mr Lee's complaint about the possibility of their release

Mustafa (Abu Hamza) v. the UK (no. 1)

18.01.2011
Applicant's conviction for inciting racial hatred: alleged bias of jury owing to adverse pre-trial publicity
No violation of Article 6 (right to a fair trial)

Edwards and Lewis v. the UK

27.10.2004 (Grand Chamber judgment)
The applicants complained about a lack of disclosure by the prosecution in criminal proceedings.
Violation of Article 6 (right to a fair trial)

Stafford v. the UK

28.05.2002 (Grand Chamber judgment)
The applicant, formerly sentenced to a life sentence, was released on parole. He was recalled to prison following charges of counterfeiting and the Secretary of State later ordered his continued detention pursuant to the original life sentence.
Violation of Article 5 § 1 (right to liberty and security)

Rowe and Davis v. the UK

16.02.2000 (Grand Chamber judgment)
The applicants complained about a lack of disclosure by the prosecution in criminal proceedings.
Violation of Article 6 (right to a fair trial)

Jasper v. the UK

16.02.2000 (Grand Chamber judgment)
The applicant complained about a lack of disclosure by the prosecution in criminal proceedings.
No violation of Article 6 (right to a fair trial)

John Murray v. the UK

08.02.1996
In criminal proceedings, inferences were drawn by the trial judge from the applicant's silence when first arrested and interrogated by the police.
No violation of Article 6 (right to a fair trial)

Fox, Campbell and Hartley v. the UK

30.08.1990

The applicants, residents of Northern Ireland, were arrested and detained by the police under anti-terrorism legislation. They argued that the Government had failed to show that there was a "reasonable suspicion" that they had committed terrorist offences.

Violation of Article 5 § 1 (right to liberty and security)

Hearsay evidence

Horncastle and Others v. the UK

16.12.2014

The case concerned four applicants' complaints that in admitting victims' written statements as evidence against them at their criminal trials the domestic courts had violated their right to have examined witnesses who gave sole or decisive evidence against them.

No violation of Article 6 §§ 1 and 3 (d) (right to a fair trial and right to obtain attendance and examination of witnesses)

Al Khawaja and Tahery v. the UK

15.12.2011 (Grand Chamber judgment)

Concerned use of hearsay evidence at trial. The applicants complained that their convictions had been based on statements from witnesses who could not be cross examined in court and that they had therefore been denied a fair trial.

The ECtHR agreed with the domestic courts and found that a conviction based solely or decisively on the statement of an absent witness would not automatically result in a breach of Article 6 § 1. However, counterbalancing factors had to be in place, including strong procedural safeguards, to compensate for the difficulties caused to the defence.

No violation of Article 6 § 1 read in conjunction with Article 6 § 3 (d) (right to obtain attendance and examination of witnesses) in respect of Mr Al-Khawaja

Violation of Article 6 § 1 read in conjunction with Article 6 § 3 (d) in respect of Mr Tahery

Similar case, declared inadmissible on 10.04.2012: **Ellis and Simms and Martin v. the UK**

Landlord-tenant relationships

F.J.M. v. the UK (no. 76202/16)

29.11.2018 (decision on the admissibility)

The case concerned a possession order against a tenant after the landlords, who were also her parents, defaulted on their mortgage payments. The applicant complained under Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life and the home) that the UK courts had refused to carry out a balancing exercise between her rights as a tenant to not lose her home and the mortgagee's right to be repaid.

Application declared inadmissible.

McCann v. the UK

13.05.2008

The case concerned Mr McCann's complaint about eviction proceedings brought against him by Birmingham City Council.

Violation of Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life)

Confiscation

Paulet v. the UK

13.05.2014

The case concerned the confiscation of Mr Paulet's wages following his conviction for obtaining employment using a false passport. Mr Paulet complained that the confiscation order against him had been disproportionate as it amounted to the confiscation of his entire savings over nearly four years of genuine work.

Violation of Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 (protection of property)

The Court found that the national law, as it stood at the time, did not allow the British courts to look into the proportionality aspect of the decision to confiscate Mr Paulet's wages and there was therefore a violation of Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 on procedural grounds.

Children

R.P. and Others v. the UK (no. 38245/08)

09.10.2012

RP, who has a significant learning disability, complained about the decision to take her daughter into local authority care and to subsequently place her for adoption.

No violation of Article 6 § 1 (right of access to court)

Ali v. the UK

11.01.2011

Concerned the temporary exclusion from secondary school of a student suspected of having started a fire in a classroom.

No violation of Article 2 of Protocol No. 1 (right to education)

P.F. and E.F. v. the UK (no. 28326/09)

23.11.2010

Concerned the steps which police officers were required to take to protect Catholic schoolchildren in Northern Ireland from the risks posed by Loyalist protestors.

Complaints under Articles 3 (prohibition of ill-treatment), 8 (right to respect for family and private life), 13 (right to an effective remedy) and 14 (prohibition of discrimination) declared inadmissible.

Z and Others v. the UK (no. 29392/95)

10.05.2001 (Grand Chamber judgment)

Concerned the failure of the local authority to protect four siblings from serious physical and sexual abuse by their parents, of which social workers knew or ought to have had knowledge.

Violation of Article 3 (prohibition of torture and ill-treatment) read alone and together with Article 13 (right to an effective remedy)

No violation of Article 6 (right to a fair trial)

T. v. the UK (no. 24724/94)
V. v. the UK (no. 24888/94)

16.12.1999 (Grand Chamber judgments)

The applicants were 11-year-old boys charged with murder who complained about their trial in public in an adult Crown Court and the fact that the length of their detention was decided by the Home Secretary and not an independent judge.

Violations of Article 6 (right to a fair trial) and Article 5 § 4 (right to liberty and security); no violation of Article 3 (prohibition of inhuman or degrading treatment)

A. v. the UK (no. 25599/94)

23.09.1998

Concerned a minor who was hit hard and repeatedly with a wooden cane by his stepfather. The stepfather was charged with assault occasioning actual bodily harm but was acquitted by a jury which accepted his defence of "reasonable chastisement".

Violation of Article 3 (prohibition of inhuman or degrading treatment)

Campbell and Cosans v. the UK

25.02.1982

Concerned parents' complaint about use of corporal punishment as a disciplinary measure in State schools in Scotland attended by their children.

No violation of Article 3 (prohibition of inhuman or degrading treatment)

Violations of Article 2 of Protocol No. 1 (right to education)

Education

Pending cases

CC v. the UK (no. 25191/23)

Q v. the UK (no. 11826/23)

Cases concerning children with disabilities.

Ali v. the UK

11.01.2011

Concerned the temporary exclusion from secondary school of a student suspected of having started a fire in a classroom.

No violation of Article 2 of Protocol No. 1 (right to education)

Campbell and Cosans v. the UK

25.02.1982

Concerned parents' complaint about use of corporal punishment as a disciplinary measure in State schools in Scotland attended by their children.

No violation of Article 3 (prohibition of inhuman or degrading treatment)

Violations of Article 2 of Protocol No. 1 (right to education)

Voting rights

Hora v. the UK

23.09.2025

The case concerned prisoner voting in the United Kingdom. The applicant's case was the first to come before the Court concerning an election which had taken place following the steps taken by the United Kingdom to enforce the Court's judgment in the case of *Hirst v. the UK (no. 2)* (application no. 74525/01) (see below).

No violation of Article 3 of Protocol No. 1 (right to free elections)

Bradshaw and Others v. the UK

22.07.2025

The case concerned the Government's response to reports of interference by Russia in the United Kingdom's democratic processes, including the 2019 general election.

No violation of Article 3 of Protocol No. 1 (right to free elections)

McHugh and Others v. the UK

10.02.2015

The case concerned 1,015 prisoners who, as an automatic consequence of their convictions and detention pursuant to sentences of imprisonment, were unable to vote in elections.

The Court concluded that there had been a violation of Article 3 of Protocol No. 1 (right to free elections) because the case was identical to other prisoner voting cases in which a breach of the right to vote had been found and the relevant legislation had not yet been amended. **It rejected the applicants' claim for compensation and legal costs.**

See also, more recently: Millbank and Others v. the United Kingdom, judgment of 30 June 2016.

Firth and Others v. the UK

12.08.2014

The case concerned ten prisoners who, as an automatic consequence of their convictions and detention pursuant to sentences of imprisonment, were unable to vote in elections to the European Parliament on 4 June 2009.

Violation of Article 3 of Protocol No. 1 (right to free elections)

The Court concluded that there had been a violation of Article 3 of Protocol No. 1 because the case was identical to another prisoner voting case (*Greens and M.T. v. the UK*, see below) in which a breach of the right to vote had been found and the relevant legislation had not yet been amended. It rejected the applicants' claim for compensation and legal costs.

Dunn and others v. the UK

13.05.2014

In these applications, the applicants had complained about "forthcoming" elections. Assuming that they had articulated sufficiently clear complaints as regards any potential exclusion from those elections, the Court found that they had failed to adduce the necessary facts to substantiate their complaints since they had not subsequently confirmed that they were in post-conviction detention on the date of the elections in question.

Applications declared inadmissible

McLean and Cole v. the UK

11.06.2013

Relying on Article 3 of Protocol No. 1 (right to free elections), the applicants complained that they had been subject to a blanket ban on voting in elections and had been, or would be, prevented from voting in further elections.

The Court found the applicants' complaints inadmissible because they were filed too late or prematurely or because they were about elections not covered by the European Convention.

Shindler v. the UK

07.05.2013

The case concerned whether the right to vote of a British national not resident in the United Kingdom since 1982 had been violated by election laws preventing those resident outside of the United Kingdom for more than 15 years from voting.

No violation of Article 3 of Protocol No. 1 (right to free elections)

The Court, taking into account the room for manoeuvre ('margin of appreciation') to be left to the UK Government in regulating its parliamentary elections, decided that the election law in question had not gone too far in restricting the right to Mr Shindler's right to free elections

Greens and M.T. v. the UK (nos. 60041/08 and 60054/08)

23.11.2010

Concerned the continued failure to amend the legislation imposing a blanket ban on voting in national and European elections for convicted prisoners in detention in the UK.

Violation of Article 3 of Protocol No. 1 (right to free elections)

The Court found that the violation was due to the UK's failure to implement the Court's Grand Chamber judgment in **Hirst v. the UK (no. 2)** of 06.10.2005, in which it had also found a violation of Article 3 of Protocol No. 1 on account of the automatic and

indiscriminate restriction on Mr Hirst's right to vote due to his status as a convicted prisoner.

LGBT rights[1]

Pending case

Ferguson and Others v. the UK (35043/22)

The case concerns the recognition of same-sex marriage in Bermuda.

J. M. v. the UK (no. 37060/06)

28.09.2010

Concerned rules on child maintenance which prior to the introduction of the Civil Partnership Act discriminated against those in same-sex relationships.

Violation of Article 14 of the Convention (prohibition of discrimination) in conjunction with Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 (protection of property)

B.B. v. the UK (no. 53760/00)

10.02.2004

Concerned the prosecution of an adult male for engaging in "buggery" with a 16-year-old male. At the time it was a criminal offence to engage in homosexual activities with men under 18 years of age whereas the age of consent for heterosexual activities was fixed at 16.

Violation of Article 14 of the Convention read together with Article 8 (right to respect for family and private life).

Christine Goodwin v. the UK

11.07.2002 (Grand Chamber judgment)

Concerned the lack of legal recognition of the post-operative sex of a male to female transsexual. In particular, it concerned her treatment in relation to employment, social security and pensions and her inability to marry.

Violations of Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life) and Article 12 (right to marry and to found a family); no violation of Article 13 (right to an effective remedy)

A.D.T. v. the UK (no. 35765/97)

31.07.2000

Concerned the prosecution of an adult male for gross indecency after he was found to have engaged in sexual activity in his home in the presence of more than two other men.

Violation of Article 8 (right to respect for family and private life)

Smith and Grady v. the UK

27.12.1999

Concerned the discharge of British nationals from the armed forces on account of their sexual orientation. Prior to their discharge they were interviewed by interrogators who asked them detailed questions about their sexuality and sexual history.

Violation of Article 8 (right to respect for family and private life and Article 13 (right to an effective remedy)

X, Y and Z v. the UK (no. 21830/93)

22.04.1997

Concerned the refusal to register a female to male transsexual as the father of a child.

No violation of Article 8 (right to respect for family and private life), read alone or together with Article 14 (prohibition on discrimination)

Dudgeon v. the UK

22.10.1981

Concerned the continued criminalisation of certain homosexual acts (including committing and attempting to commit buggery) between consenting males in Northern Ireland.

Violation of Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life)

Police powers, surveillance and data protection

Big Brother Watch and Others v. the United Kingdom

25.05.2021 (Grand Chamber judgment)

The case concerned complaints by journalists and human-rights organisations in regard to three different surveillance regimes: (1) the bulk interception of communications; (2) the receipt of intercept material from foreign governments and intelligence agencies; (3) the obtaining of communications data from communication service providers.

Violation of Article 8 of the European Convention (right to respect for private and family life/communications) in respect of the bulk intercept regime

[1] Lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender

Violation of Article 8 in respect of the regime for obtaining communications data from communication service providers
No violation of Article 8 in respect of the United Kingdom's regime for requesting intercepted material from foreign Governments and intelligence agencies
Violation of Article 10 (freedom of expression), concerning both the bulk interception regime and the regime for obtaining communications data from communication service providers
No violation of Article 10 in respect of the regime for requesting intercepted material from foreign Governments and intelligence agencies

Gaughran v. the UK

13.02.2020
The case concerned a complaint about the indefinite retention of personal data (DNA profile, fingerprints and photograph) of a man who had a spent conviction for driving with excess alcohol in Northern Ireland.
Violation of Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life)

Garamukanwa v. the UK

06.06.2019 (decision on the admissibility)
The case concerned Mr Garamukanwa's dismissal by a state-run health service after an investigation for harassment based on photographs stored on his iPhone, and on emails and WhatsApp correspondence.
Case declared inadmissible.

Eiseman-Renyard v. the UK

28.03.2019 (decision on the admissibility)
The case concerned the applicants' complaint about their arrest and detention for several hours on 29 April 2011 at various places in central London to prevent a breach of the peace during the Duke and Duchess of Cambridge's wedding. Their appeals before the domestic courts were ultimately dismissed by the Supreme Court in 2017.
Case declared inadmissible

Catt v. the UK

24.01.2019
The case concerned the applicant's complaint about the collection and retention of his personal data in a police database for "domestic extremists".
Violation of Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life)

R.E. v. the UK (no. 62498/11)

27.10.2015
The case concerned the regime for covert surveillance of consultations between detainees and their lawyers and between vulnerable detainees[2] and "appropriate adults"[3].
Violation of Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life, home and correspondence) as concerned the covert surveillance of legal consultations
No violation of Article 8 as concerned the covert surveillance of consultations between detainees and their "appropriate adults"

Austin and Others v. the UK

15.03.2012 (Grand Chamber judgment)
The case concerned a complaint by a demonstrator and some passers-by that they were not allowed to exit a police cordon for almost seven hours during a protest against globalisation in London.
No violation of Article 5 (right to liberty and security)
The Court notably found that the people within the cordon had not been deprived of their liberty within the meaning of the Convention. In particular, the police had imposed the cordon to isolate and contain a large crowd in dangerous and volatile conditions. This had been the least intrusive and most effective means to protect the public from violence.

Kennedy v. the UK

18.05.2010
The case concerned system for interception of communications under the Regulation of Investigatory Powers Act 2000.
No violation of Article 8 (right to respect for private life)

Gillan and Quinton v. the UK

12.01.2010
The case concerned the power under sections 44-47 of the Terrorism Act 2000 to stop and search individuals without reasonable suspicion of wrongdoing.
Violation of Article 8 (right to respect for private life)

[2] A juvenile or person who is mentally disordered or otherwise mentally vulnerable.

[3] An "appropriate adult" could be a relative or guardian, or a person experienced in dealing with mentally disordered or mentally vulnerable people.

S. and Marper v. the UK (nos. 30562/04 and 30566/04)
04.12.2008 (Grand Chamber judgment)
The case concerned storage of DNA on a police database following acquittal/release without charge.
Violation of Article 8 (right to respect for private life)

Liberty and Other Organisations v. the UK
01.07.2008
The case concerned system for interception of external communications under the Interception of Communications Act 1985, and particularly system of safeguards against abuse.
Violation of Article 8 (right to respect for private life)

Malone v. the UK
02.08.1984
The case concerned police powers to intercept telephone calls and the lack of any legislation to regulate this in the UK
Violation of Article 8 (right to respect for private life)

Bio-ethics and euthanasia

Nicklinson and Lamb v. the UK
16.07.2015
The case concerned the compatibility of the ban on assisted suicide and voluntary euthanasia in the United Kingdom with Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life) of the Convention.
Applications of Ms Nicklinson and Mr Lamb declared inadmissible.

Evans v. the UK
10.04.2007 (Grand Chamber judgment)
Concerned the applicant's complaint that domestic law permitted her former partner to withdraw his consent to storage and use by her of embryos created jointly by them, preventing her from ever having a child to whom she would be genetically related.
No violation of Articles 2 (right to life), 8 (right to respect for private and family life) or 14 (prohibition of discrimination)

Pretty v. the UK
29.04.2002
Dying of motor neurone disease, Ms Pretty argued that it was for the individual to choose whether to live and that the right to die was the corollary of the right to live and also protected. She also sought an undertaking that her husband would not be prosecuted if he assisted her to commit suicide.
No violation of Articles 2 (right to life), 3 (prohibition of inhuman or degrading treatment), 8 (right to respect for private and family life), 9 (freedom of thought) or 14 (prohibition of discrimination)

Freedom of information

Times Newspapers Limited and Kennedy v. the UK
06.12.2018 (decision on the admissibility)
The case concerned the complaint by a newspaper and one of its journalists about the refusal of a request, under freedom of information legislation, for information from the Charity Commission for England and Wales about a charity set up by a Member of Parliament.
Application declared inadmissible.

Roche v. the UK
19.10.2005 (Grand Chamber judgment)
Concerned a complaint by a former soldier that he was used for the testing of chemical weapons at the Chemical and Biological Defence Establishment at Porton Down between 1962-1963 and was denied access to medical records held by the Ministry of Defence
Violation of Article 8 (right to respect for private life)

Gaskin v. the UK
07.07.1989
Concerned a complaint by an adult taken into care as a baby and ill-treated by foster parents that he had no right of access to local authority records concerning his care history
Violation of Article 8 (right to respect for private life)

Freedom of association

Redfearn v. the UK
06.11.2012
Concerned a complaint by a member of the British National Party ("the BNP") – a far-right political party which, at the time, restricted membership to white nationals – that he had been dismissed from his job as a driver transporting disabled persons, who were mostly Asian.

Violation of 11 (freedom of association)

Trade Unions

Pending case

POA Prison Officers' Association v. the UK (29545/22)

The case concerns a trade union's complaints about a statutory strike ban on prison officers.

R.M.T. v. the UK (no. no. 31045/10)

08.04.2014

Concerned a trade union's complaints about statutory restrictions on the right to strike and, in particular, the ban on secondary industrial action (strike action against a different employer aimed at exerting indirect pressure on the employer involved in the industrial dispute).

No violation of Article 11 (freedom of association)

Wilson and the National Union of Journalists and Others v. the UK

02.07.2002

Complaint by Daily Mail journalists and others that UK law did not prevent their employers from offering more pay to employees prepared to renounce union rights

Violation of Article 11 (freedom of assembly)

Young, James and Webster v. the UK

13.08.1981

Complaint about a "closed shop" agreement at British Rail which caused the applicants to lose their jobs because they refused to join one of the unions within the agreement

Violation of Article 11 (freedom of assembly)

The right to life

Parfitt v. the United Kingdom

21.04.2021

Decision to withdraw life-sustaining treatment for child suffering from terminal medical condition, based on her "best interests".

See press release published on 21 April 2021

Application declared inadmissible

Chong and Others v. the UK

04.10.2018 (decision on the admissibility)

The case concerned the killing of 24 men in December 1948 by British soldiers in the village of Batang Kali in Selangor, which is now a state of Malaysia but at the time was part of the British Empire.

The applicants complained before the European Court that there had never been a full and independent public inquiry into the killings.

The Court found that the applicants' complaint was not within its jurisdiction (*ratione temporis*) because the deaths had occurred more than ten years before the United Kingdom had given individual applicants the right to apply directly to the Court. In any case, new evidence had come to light as early as 1970, when the soldiers had admitted that they had been ordered to carry out the massacre, so the applicants had lodged their application long after the Convention time-limit.

Gard and Others v. the UK

27.06.2017 (decision on the admissibility)

The case concerned Charlie Gard, a baby suffering from a rare and fatal genetic disease. In February 2017, the treating hospital sought a declaration from the domestic courts as to whether it would be lawful to withdraw artificial ventilation and provide Charlie with palliative care. Charlie's parents also asked the courts to consider whether it would be in the best interests of their son to undergo experimental treatment in the U.S.A.. The domestic courts concluded that it would be lawful for the hospital to withdraw life sustaining treatment because it was likely that Charlie would suffer significant harm if his present suffering was prolonged without any realistic prospect of improvement, and the experimental therapy would be of no effective benefit.

The Court endorsed in substance the approach by the domestic courts and declared the application inadmissible.

Armani Da Silva v. the UK

30.03.2016 (Grand Chamber judgment)

The case concerned the fatal shooting of Jean Charles de Menezes, a Brazilian national mistakenly identified by the police as a suicide bomber. Ms Armani Da Silva, who is Mr de Menezes' cousin, complained that the State had not fulfilled its duty to

ensure the accountability of its agents for his death because the ensuing investigation had not led to the prosecution of any individual police officer.
No violation of Article 2 (right to life – investigation)

Harrison and Others v. the UK

25.03.2014 (decision on the admissibility)
The applications concerned the applicants' complaint that the British authorities had not effectively investigated the deaths of the 96 football supporters who were killed in a crush at a football stadium in 1989.
The applicants, relatives of the supporters who died in the disaster, complained under Article 2 of the Convention that the original inquest had been inadequate and, that although new inquests had been ordered, they had to wait for over 24 years for a fresh investigation which complied with Article 2 of the Convention.
Applications declared inadmissible.

McCaughey and Others v. the UK
Collette and Michael Hemsworth v. the UK

16.07.2013
Both cases concerned the death of the applicants' relatives at the hands of security forces in Northern Ireland.
The Court **declared most of the applicants' complaints inadmissible** as premature and/or on the ground of a failure to exhaust domestic remedies because the investigations were still pending and domestic law required, since 2011, that those investigations be conducted in accordance with Article 2 of the Convention. The admissible complaints concerned the procedural aspect of Article 2 namely, the length of the investigations which had lasted for 23 years in the McCaughey case and 13 years in the Hemsworth case.
The Court held that there had been a violation of Article 2 (procedural investigation obligations) in both cases on account of the excessive investigative delays.
The Court further noted that the investigations, notably the holding of "legacy inquests", into killings by the security forces in Northern Ireland had been marked by major delays and that such delays remained a serious and extensive problem.
See also McDonnell v UK, judgment of 09/12/2014.

Van Colle v. the UK

13.11.2012
Concerned the murder of the applicants' son in 2000 by his former employee, who was the accused in criminal proceedings for theft in which their son had been a witness. The applicants alleged that the police had failed in their duty to protect their son as they had been aware that his former employee had been threatening him.
No violation of Article 2 (right to life)
No violation of Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life)

Reynolds v. the UK

13.03.2012
Concerned the death of the applicant's son, a psychiatric patient diagnosed with schizophrenia, in 2005 following his fall from the sixth floor of a public care unit. Ms Reynolds complained that no effective mechanism had been available to her whereby civil liability could be determined for the alleged negligent care of her son and by which she could have obtained compensation for her loss.
Violation of Article 13 (right to an effective remedy) in conjunction with Article 2 (right to life)

Alder v. the UK

22.11.2011 – application struck out of the list of cases
Concerned the death of a man of Nigerian origin with visible injuries and in visible physical distress while on the floor of a police custody unit in the presence of police officers.
The UK Government accepted that there had been a lack of an effective investigation into Mr Alder's death, in violation of Articles 2 (right to life) and 3 (prohibition of inhuman and degrading treatment), and that he had been subjected to ill-treatment in police custody, in violation of Article 3 in conjunction with Article 14 (prohibition of discrimination). Given those admissions as well as the amount of compensation proposed, the Court considered that it was no longer justified to continue the examination of the case and decided to strike it out of its list of cases.

Finucane v. the UK
01.07.2003

Shanaghan v. the UK
04.05.2001
Concerned the murder of each applicant by loyalist paramilitaries, alleged collusion by the security forces and the lack of an effective investigation
Violation of Article 2 (right to life)

McKerr v. the UK and Hugh Jordan v. the UK
04.05.2001
Concerned the fatal shooting of each applicant by RUC officers in 1982 and 1992 respectively, the alleged "shoot to kill" policy applied by the RUC and the failure to conduct a full and public investigation
Violation of Article 2 (right to life)

Keenan v. UK
03.04.2001
Concerned a complaint by the mother of a 28 year-old man who hung himself in prison, that the prison authorities should have known of the risk and done more to avert it and that, as the deceased's mother, she could not bring negligence proceedings in the UK courts
No violation of Article 2 (right to life); violation of Article 3 (right not to be subjected to inhuman or degrading treatment)
Violation of Article 13 (right to an effective remedy)

Osman v. the UK
28.10.1998
Concerned the murder and wounding of a father and son by the son's teacher, who had been stalking and threatening him, and the extent to which the police should have acted to protect the family
No violation of Article 2 (right to life)
Violation of Article 6 (right to a fair trial)

McCann and Others v. the UK
27.09.1995
Concerned complaints about the planning of a security operation which led to the fatal shooting of three members of the IRA during a terrorist operation in Gibraltar and the subsequent investigation into the incident.
Violation of Article 2 (right to life)

Trafficking and domestic servitude

V.C.L. AND A.N. v. the United Kingdom (nos. 77587/12 and 74603/12)
16.02.2021
The case concerned two Vietnamese youths who police officers had discovered working on cannabis farms. They were arrested and charged with drugs-related offences, to which they pleaded guilty. Following their conviction they were detained in young offenders' institutes. A competent authority subsequently recognised them as victims of trafficking. However, the prosecution service having reviewed its decision to prosecute them, concluded that they were not victims of trafficking and the Court of Appeal found on the facts of each case that the decision to prosecute had been justified.
Violation of Article 4 (prohibition of forced labour)
Violation of Article 6 § 1 (right to a fair trial).

F.A. v. the UK (no. 20658/11)
10.09.2013
The applicant alleged that she had been trafficked to the United Kingdom and forced into prostitution. She complained in particular that her removal to Ghana would put her at risk of falling into the hands of her former traffickers or into the hands of new traffickers. She further alleged that, as she had contracted HIV in the United Kingdom as a direct result of trafficking and sexual exploitation, the State was under a positive obligation to allow her to remain in the United Kingdom to access the necessary medical treatment.
Application declared inadmissible

Kawogo v. the UK
03.09.2013
A Tanzanian national complained under Articles 4 (prohibition of slavery and forced labour) and 13 (right to an effective remedy) that she had been kept in domestic servitude in the United Kingdom and that domestic law had not provided her with any remedy in respect of this.
Application declared inadmissible

C.N. v. the UK (no. 4239/08)

13.11.2012

The case concerned allegations of domestic servitude by a Ugandan woman who complained that she had been forced into working as a live-in carer.

Violation of Article 4 (prohibition of slavery and forced labour)

The Court found that the legislative provisions in force in the United Kingdom at the relevant time had been inadequate to afford practical and effective protection against treatment contrary to Article 4. Due to this absence of specific legislation criminalising domestic servitude, the investigation into the applicant's allegations of domestic servitude had been ineffective.

Deprivation of nationality

Pending case

Begum v. the UK (no. 36427/24)

Concerns a 2019 decision to deprive the applicant of her British citizenship. The applicant had left the UK in 2015, then age 15, to travel to Syria to align herself with the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant.

Civil immunity for torture

Jones and Others v. the UK (nos. 34356/06 and no. 40528/06)

14.01.2014

The case concerned four British nationals who alleged that they had been tortured in Saudi Arabia by Saudi State officials. The applicants complained about the UK courts' subsequent dismissal for reasons of State immunity of their civil claims for compensation against Saudi Arabia and its officials.

No violation of Article 6 § 1 (right of access to a court) either as concerned Mr Jones' claim against the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia or as concerned all four applicants' claims against named Saudi Arabian officials.

The ECtHR upheld the House of Lords' decision that State immunity applied in civil cases involving torture of UK nationals by Saudi Arabian officials abroad but said that the matter had to be kept under review.

Parliamentary privileges and immunity

Green v. the UK

08.04.2025

The case concerned the question of whether States have a duty to take measures to prevent parliamentary privilege being used to circumvent a court injunction. In 2018 the applicant in the case, Philip Nigel Ross Green, a well-known businessman, was granted an interim injunction against the Telegraph group to prevent it from identifying him as the subject of allegations of sexual harassment and bullying made by former employees. Invoking parliamentary privilege, a member of the House of Lords took the floor of the House after a debate and identified Mr Green as the subject of the allegations, despite the interim injunction.

No violation of Article 8 (right to respect for private life)

Interstate cases

Pending case

Ireland v. the UK (III) (no. 1859/24)

The application concerns the Northern Ireland Troubles (Legacy and Reconciliation) Act 2023, which was signed into UK law on 18 September 2023.

Further information on inter-State cases and how they are processed can be found here.

Ireland v. United Kingdom (II) (no. 5451/72)

Decision (struck off the list)

Ireland v. the UK (I)

18.01.1978

UK authorities' interrogation techniques in Northern Ireland from 1971 to 1975.

Violation of Article 3 (prohibition of torture), no violation of Articles 5 (right to liberty and security), 14 (prohibition of discrimination) and 15 (derogation in time of emergency)

In December 2014 Ireland requested a revision of the Court's judgment of 18 January 1978 on the grounds that new evidence had emerged. Ireland argued that declassified UK documents showed, firstly,

that the effects of the ill-treatment had been long-term and severe and, secondly, demonstrated the extent to which the British Government had adopted and implemented a policy of non-disclosure about key facts concerning the interrogation techniques at the time of the original proceedings.

On 20 March 2018, the Court found that the Government of Ireland had not provided sufficient prima facie evidence for the first alleged new fact or demonstrated the existence of facts that were unknown to the Court at the time. It also found that even if Ireland had demonstrated the first alleged fact, that would not have had a decisive influence on the original judgment. There was therefore no justification for a revision decision. The revision request was dismissed by six votes to one by a Chamber.

ECtHR Press Unit Contact:
Tracey Turner-Tretz
+33 (0)3 90 21 42 08