Collection of judgments of the European Court for Human Rights

gathered in the Guide on Article 13 Updated on 30 April 2020

this version and the Dutch version are authentic

Introduction

The European Court of Human Rights (hereafter**:** ECofHR) published a Guide "on Article 13 of the Convention on Human Rights". Due to the evidence of and by this Guide of many violations, infringes and breaches of contract is this Guide emphatically scrutinised. This guide is downloaded at the URL**:** https://www.echr.coe.int/Documents/Guide_Art_13_ENG.pdf, and available at this site behind item 5.

Hereafter the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms is abbreviated to ECHR.

Survey of the Guide

The Guide has, after introducing information for readers, two chapters and in total 300 paragraphs. In this scrutiny is the part of A, B and C audited.

Introduction of the Public Scrutiny

(Quoted:) It would be inconceivable, in the opinion of the Court, that Article 6 para. 1 (art. 6-1) should describe in detail the procedural guarantees afforded to parties in a pending lawsuit and should not first protect that which alone makes it in fact possible to benefit from such guarantees (§35). In §36 are the fair, public and expeditious characteristics of article 6, §1 regarded without elaboration. Later is elaborated in the judgment of the Case of Pretto and Others vs Italy, 8 December 1983, §21 the cause and goal of the obligated public pronouncement of a judgment namely, to ensure scrutiny of the judiciary by the public with a view to safeguarding the right to a fair trial (Case of Pretto, §27). This case in 1983 does not change the retroactivity of each ECofHR's judgment and so of the public scrutiny down from the date that the ECHR came in power.

The public scrutiny is a unity and an equally "established by law" or an equally by "law making treaty" (§36) established judging authority like every (disciplinary) tribunal.
The European public sizes to about 450 million citizens minus the governmental employees, public servants and officers. In article 6, §1, ECHR, is also the press excluded from the public. Who are member of the public scrutiny is described in the "Manual for public scrutiny" (URL: www.publicscrutiny.nl, item 4). Why the public scrutiny is a unity and by what it is united is sufficiently explained also in the "Manual for public scrutiny" and in paragraph 18e of the report on the Golder case.

Introduction of the European Court of Human Rights

The ECofHR has jurisdiction that shall extend to all matters concerning the interpretation and application of the Convention and the Protocols thereto (article 32, §1). In the event of dispute as to whether the Court has jurisdiction, the Court shall decide (article 32, §2). So, the ECofHR has dictatorship on the interpretation and application of the ECHR.

The Court may, at the request of the Committee of Ministers, give advisory opinions on legal questions concerning the interpretation of the Convention and the Protocols thereto (article 47, §1). The Court shall decide whether a request for an advisory opinion submitted by the Committee of Ministers is within its competence as defined in Article 47 (article 48). So, the ECofHR has dictatorship on giving advisory opinions on legal questions concerning the interpretation (not the application) of the ECHR.

The final judgment shall be published (article 44, §3). Advisory opinions of the Court shall be communicated to the Committee of Ministers (article 49, §3). So, the judgments of the ECofHR are published and therefore within the public scrutiny's jurisdiction while ECofHR's advisory opinions are secret and therefore outside the public scrutiny's jurisdiction.

Before taking up office, each elected judge shall, at the first sitting of the plenary Court at which the judge is present or, in case of need, before the President of the Court, take the following oath or make the following solemn declaration: "I swear" – or "I solemnly declare" – "that I will exercise my functions as a judge honourably, independently and impartially and that I will keep secret all deliberations."

The obligatory principles for any scrutiny of the judiciary

Good faith is surely absent because otherwise each dispute has two justices while only one is possible to be in line with the author; respecting good faith without discrimination makes a just scrutiny or court trial fake and useless.

The evidences of perjury, abuse or infringements do not change that the offenders are able whether or not by accident to express just findings or conclusions. Also offending courts do not change this.

Each lawsuit is one party who executes his rights (empowerment is a right) against an opposite party who is unwilling to endure this execution. This examined case of Golder attests a government unwilling to agree with the Commission. The reason for just scrutiny is to unveil the cause in effort to a solution**:** is it a contrary right, a lack of knowledge about the (executing) right or sometimes is it to make disadvantage or worse. A judge is equipped and facilitated to disclose the legislative author's working papers to publish its cogitation, object and purpose with the law and involved articles. This is a demanded obligation.

The place and importance of the ECHR

The ECHR is the non-tolerant and non-exceedable outline boundary of the "Rule of Law", in which all the activities or human resultings happen (see paragraph "Introduction"). Not the same but close comparable with the safety rules for products in the society, which have their own particular rules for construction and working. So, how well and according the law a product is made, when it does not pass the safety rules it is out of use and out of the human lives in a together living society.

The ECHR is a regular contract, with at one side the Contracting States and on the other side everyone (article 1, ECHR). Each breach of contract has also legal results by the Agreements Rights in the country where the offences take place.

The Human Rights do not turn over roles, exchange with persons in their official capacity or turn over the occurred levels of power. The Human Rights is nothing more and nothing less then an equalizing power.

Final Conclusions on the judgments within the Human Rights

The misleading by the information of the ECofHR

(1) The Guide is published by the ECofHR but nevertheless (quote**:**) "(…) does not bind the Court". When the ECofHR declares that its judgments do not bind itself then it equally does not bind the States or the private individuals. So, believing the Guide does not bind, then the European Human Rights Judiciary is a fake, which is not the cogitation, object or purpose of the ECHR and not the ECHR's author. Then it is, inter alia, a breach of contract. When not believing the Guide does not bind, then the European Human Rights Judiciary is unreliable system that spread lies. Both infringe the ECHR.

(2) (Quote**:**) "This Guide has been prepared under the authority of the Jurisconsult". This Juriconsult is a business which has a financial or economic interest with the selection of the published information. And a similar interest in leaving out disliked information. This does not change the accountability of the ECofHR which is expressed by the note of copyrights.

(3) In the "Note to the readers" is declared that (quote**:**) "This Guide is (…) to inform legal practitioners (…)". This scorns and discriminates the private individual and the public scrutiny. Earlier confessed the ECofHR that any law is written <u>firstly</u> for the private individuals by stating in awareness that (quote**:**) "(…) the "contestation" (claim) generally exists prior to the legal proceedings (…) (*Case of Golder v. the United Kingdom, 21 February 1975, §32*). Later is, retroactive, more express explained that (quote:) "a rule (…) is formulated with sufficient precision to enable any individual (…) to regulate his conduct." (*Case of Rotaru v. Romania, 4 May 2000, §55*), thus the judgments too.

The fundamental offences, violations, infringes and breach of contract

(4) The article 13 of the ECHR is (quote**:**) "Everyone whose rights and freedoms as set forth in this Convention are violated shall have an effective remedy before a national

authority notwithstanding that the violation has been committed by persons acting in an official capacity.". Already the express terms are quite clear. Nevertheless needs the ECofHR 392 judgments (Page 77, List of cited cases) to pretend to interpret the one article 13. Although the ECHR is signed 4 November 1950 and 20 March 1952 still at 30 January 2020 (*J.M. B. and Others vs. France*) a judgment is created to pretend to interpret and is published. These judgments are solely for work acquisition and also therefore a disastrous abuse of power, authority and the ECHR. The public scrutiny shall explain this.

(5) **Interpreting the latent or implied human rights**
Already with judgment in the case of Golder vs. the United Kingdom, 21 February 1975, §28 up to §32, is the interpreting of latent rights sufficient deliberated. The deliberation apply the principles of interpreting**:** the latent and implied rights are the one's that, when not supplied and executed, obstruct the right in express terms to happen or to appear. Also are the latent and implied rights those which are the causal results or corollary of the right in express term that is executed.

(6) **Ignoring does not change the availability of the rules for interpreting**
So, since 21 February 1975 is interpreting sufficient clear for persons with a high moral character and with an impeccable craftsmanship. As this clarity is valid and obligatory for the interpreting of any article. Nevertheless is this knowledge or is this judgment by the own court 391 times ignored and over 45 years ignored**:** only for the acquisition of work which is absolutely not a task of the ECofHR.

(7) **Judgments later then February 1976** can not restrict the human rights and equally can not restrict the interpreted elaborations as they became integrated in the ECHR by the unanimous approving as a ECHR's right. Articles 17 or 18 prohibit this restriction. The same is valid for two (or more) dissonant interpretations. The one that protects the involved right the best is valid because the other one(s) can not restrict the best elaborated clarified right.

(8) **The 392 judgments for one ECHR article** evidences that instituting one authority does not safeguard the principle of legal certainty or legal order. On the contrary do these judgments create deliberately a huge chaos and complete uncertainty. The scorn to ignore the existing expansion of the, now in express terms clarified, implied rights of an ECHR article is disastrous for the protection claiming private individual. But this chaos is a profitable business model for the judiciary and involved judicial businesses.

(9) **The 45 years interpreting for one ECHR article** evidences that an unanimous opinion does not safeguard the principle of legal certainty or legal order. On the contrary are these years analogue to the large number of judges with each an own opinion thus a constant changing of opinions and constant changing number of the dissonant and unanimous opinions. This is the guarantee for chaos and uncertainty. But this chaos too, is a profitable business model for the judiciary and involved justiciary businesses. And a suction for persons who's ambition is to rule Europe or the world, who by default are not interested at all in human rights. These persons are not the ones with a high moral character.

(10) **Interpreting is a process of unity, a single combined operation** (*Golder vs. the United Kingdom, 21 February 1975, §30*). Also on this matter does the ECofHR violate or offend by its work or manner of work. The creation of 392 judgments (so far) or the spread out over 45 years (so far) is delivering bad work and a breach of contract.

The focus on the prologue of section A.

(11) All the paragraphs are extracted parts of judgments after the case of Golder in 1975 (*Case of Golder v. the United Kingdom, 21 February 1975*). Herein is stated that (quote**:**) "Article 13 (art. 13) speaks of an effective remedy before a "national authority" ("instance nationale") which may not be a "tribunal" or "court" within the meaning of Articles 6 para. 1 and 5 para. 4 (art. 6-1, art. 5-4). Furthermore, the effective remedy deals with the violation of a right guaranteed by the Convention, while Articles 6 para. 1 and 5 para. 4 (art. 6-1, art. 5-4) cover claims relating in the first case to the existence or scope of civil rights and in the second to the lawfulness of arrest or detention. What is more, the three provisions do not operate in the same field. The concept of "civil rights and obligations" (Article 6 para. 1) (art. 6-1) is not co-extensive with that of "rights and freedoms as set forth in this Convention" (Article 13) (art. 13), even if there may be some overlapping.". (*Case of Golder v. the United Kingdom, 21 February 1975, §33*).

(12) So, no article in the ECHR is superfluous neither is an article a remake. Also does the public scrutiny agree that article 6 is concerning the "civil rights and obligations" and article 13 is concerning the "rights and freedoms as set forth in this Convention". But the article 13 is dominated by the requirement that "the violation has been committed by persons acting in an official capacity". By this the ECHR and the ECHR's author impossibly can aim otherwise at, than at least the tribunals or the judges.

Therefore are the judgments, that are referred to in §1 up to §9 of the Guide, only for work acquisition and mainly unnecessary.

The focus on "An arguable claim".

(13) Due to the supreme knowledge of private individuals about the law and the involved law articles (see §3, above) is any claim lodged at a court of first instance always not arguable. Because any refute by an addressed party, is deliberated prior to the court trial to achieve the outcome that a satisfying agreement is not possible and a pursue is necessary to compel the enjoy of rights.

Therefore are the judgments that are referred to in §1 up to §9 only work acquisition and mainly unnecessary.

The focus on "National authority".

(14) **The ECHR foresees in violations by, inter alia, tribunals and judges** against the human rights with article 13. This article is in power for cases in which the rights are violated and furthermore that "the violation has been committed". So this is already indisputable and solidly determined and, at least, tribunals and judges know when a violation occurs and what a violation is against human rights (see §12 above). So, a court trial is unnecessary

(15) The public scrutiny recalls §13 above**:** an arguable claim does not exist. The ECHR's author establishes guarantees (article 1) and these are fulfilled by the Contract State's executive power thus inclusive the tribunal of article 6 and a national authority of article 13. All the instances are equipped with, inter alia, persons acting in an official capacity. The violation already exists thus article 13 does not aim at the process of determinating unlike the article 6. This excludes any other procedure, that only repeats and shall have the same (already known beforehand) outcome.

(16) So, the executive power of a State must put right, according to the claim like it is a

judgment and without any interference. This enforce power to compell the State's executive power is everyone's, who (quote**:**) "(…) shall have an effective remedy before a national authority (…).". The above sets forth the content of the remedy, the power of its effectivity, the task and goal of the national authority.

(17) The ECofHR determines (Quote**:**) "The "authority" referred to in Article 13 does not need, in all cases, to be a judicial institution in the strict sense or a tribunal within the meaning of Articles 6 §1 and 5 §4 of the Convention (Golder v. the United Kingdom, 1975, §33; Klass and Others v. Germany, 1978, §67; Rotaru v. Romania [GC], 2000, §69; Driza v. Albania, 2007, §116). In preceding §14 up to §16 above is clarified that in all cases of violation the authority is not a judging institution.

(18) The ECofHR stated (quote**:**) "The national authority may be a quasi-judicial body such as an ombudsman (Leander v. Sweden, 1987), an administrative authority such as a government minister (Boyle and Rice v. the United Kingdom, 1988), or a political authority such as a parliamentary commission (Klass and Others v. Germany, 1978)."

The §14 up to §17 above explains that appointing an ombudsman as the meant authority is a disastrous opinion because this institute only investigates and is active in the determination processes. Also is an ombudsman by law prohibited, inter alia, to scrutinise judgments which are the evidence of violations. Furthermore, is appointing an administrative or a political authority, which together are the State's legislator, is a disastrous opinion because these too have forbidden to themselves to scrutinise any judgment, they act in the process of determination before a violation exists and they are not impartial. So, the ECofHR's statements infringe the ECHR and the ECHR's author's cogitation, object and purpose with the ECHR. The statements are impossible in line with the ECHR.

(19) **Human rights are civil rights but civil rights are not human rights**
Referring to §13 above, stated the ECofHR in reviewing any connection between the articles 13 and 6 (quote**:**) "(…) the effective remedy deals with the violation of a right (..)while Articles 6 (…) cover claims relating (…) to the existence or scope of civil rights (…)" and concluding to "the (…) provisions do not operate in the same field". The ECofHR makes a disastrous failure. The public scrutiny explains this as set forth in the paragraph hereafter.

(20) The ECHR's author did not restrict the human right in article 13, makes no ECHR's article to combat another according to article 17 and makes no article to combat with the preamble. So, the (quote**:**) "rights and freedoms as set forth in this Convention" are indisputable "civil rights" and equal to the ones mentioned in article 6. Note that civilians are always humans, while humans in, inter alia, prisons are without civil rights but keep human rights. So, article 6 covers also all human rights of the article 13, but article 13 does not cover the civil rights but the article 6 itself as human right.

(21) The author of the ECHR has foreseen with the article 6 in <u>any</u> claim against anybody (*Case of Golder v. the United Kingdom, 21 February 1975, §36*), except against the executors of article 6, who are in those cases at least not impartial and never will become impartial. The ECHR foresees herein with article 13, for cases against violations by persons acting in an official capacity. The preceding §20 explains that the guarantees of independency and impartiality from article 6 do remain unrestricted in power in article 13 and any other article regardless of a treaty or of a national law.

The focus on "An effective remedy".

(22) **Inheritance**

In the §12 above is unveiled that article 13 concerns at least tribunals or judges and in §15 above is unveiled that article 13 does not aim at a process of determination. Therefore is impossible that an effective remedy aims to any procedure or process of determination. This remedy aims at execution of protection and of putting right or compensate.

(23) The ECofHR stated in §31 that (quote**:**) "To be effective the remedy must be capable of directly remedying the impugned situation (*Pine Valley Developments Ltd and Others v. Ireland, Commission decision, 1989; se*)." . Putting first that an impugned situation does not exist but already a violation. The public scrutiny joins the ECofHR on the direct enforcement by using the remedy.

There are no judgments that improve the protecting of human rights. The ECofHR stated in §44 that (quote**:**) "In particular, the exercise of the remedy must not be unjustifiably hindered by acts or omissions of the respondent State (Aksoy v. Turkey, 1996, §95 in fine; Aydın v. Turkey, 1997, §103; Paul and Audrey Edwards v. the United Kingdom, 2002, §96)." . This confirms as sets forth in §16 above, that the effective remedy before a national authority is an enforce power to compel the State's executive power (that includes tribunals).

(24) This clarifies also, that the effective remedy before a national authority must compel the State's executive power, especially the tribunal in article 6, to respect, obey and apply the ECofHR's author's cogitation, object and purpose as well as the ECHR itself.

Almost all judgments in §31 up to §54 are acquisition of work which is absolutely not a task of the ECofHR and are unnecessary.

The focus on "Scope of article 13 of the Convention".

(25) The ECofHR stated in §55 that (quote**:**) "The scope or extent of the field of action of the obligation under Article 13 will vary depending on the nature of the complaint under the Convention (Chahal v. the United Kingdom, 1996, §§150-151; Aksoy v. Turkey, 1996, §95; Aydın v. Turkey, 1997, §103; Z and Others v. the United Kingdom [GC], 2001, §108; Paul and Audrey Edwards v. the United Kingdom, 2002, §96) or the nature of the right relied upon under the Convention (Hasan and Chaush v. Bulgaria [GC], 2000, §98)." .

(26) **Continue uncertainty and chaos by ever changing quasi-interpretations**

The ECofHR commits a disastrous crime. The public scrutiny explains this as set forth hereafter. The article 32 states the jurisdiction of the ECofHR that (quote**:**) "(…) shall extend to all matters concerning the interpretation and application of the Convention and the Protocols thereto (…)." . In §24 above the ECofHR turns around its jurisdiction and interprets "the nature of the complaint" or "the nature of the right" and applies this (with the other natures of complaints then a huge variety of interpretations) in its constant changing opinion about article 13 or other involved ECHR's article(s).

(27) **Invoke the effective remedy**

The ECofHR is already condemned for this illegal turn over. The President is notified, accused and the public scrutiny claims instant correction of this manner of work and correction retroactive of all violating judgments.

(28) The public scrutiny demands the correct jurisdiction by interpreting the ECHR once sufficiently and hereafter apply the ECHR, completed with the interpretations, in each

of all the lodged complaints. Only this complies with the international principles of a fair trial, legal certainty and a legal order.

Almost all judgments in §55 up to §63 are acquisition of work which is absolutely not a task of the ECofHR and are unnecessary.

The focus on "Acts covered by Article 13 of the Convention".

(29) The ECofHR stated in §64 that (quote**:**) "The scope of Article 13 extends to all acts in respect of which there could be a remedy under domestic law.

(30) This statement is a disastrous failure, because the scope is dominated by the main identifier (quote**:**) "(…) the violation has been committed by persons acting in an official capacity.". Furthermore, has this statement no source as of the ECofHR. Also is this statement superfluous, because the whole of ECHR, so every single article, covers all acts already regards to article 17 or 18. Besides this, contain the sub paragraphs "Acts of the administration or the executive", "Acts of he legislature", "Acts of the judiciary" and "Acts of private persons" (§65 up to §72) only restriction on article 13 so for this reason already are all of them illegal by article 17 or 18.

Almost all judgments in §64 up to §72 are acquisition of work which is absolutely not a task of the ECofHR and are unnecessary.

The focus on chapter II, article 13 in conjunction with other articles.

(31) **Inheritance**

In the §25-§26 above is set forth that the turn around of the jurisdiction by the ECofHR is illegal and therefore a crime (a last time unveiling in §30-§31 below).

In the §19-§20 above is set forth that human rights are civil rights but civil rights are not human rights. The leads to the only corollary that even when a conjunction is foreseen by the ECHR's author, then still article 13 can never be in conjunction with any other article. While this suggestion is wrong could other articles be in conjunction with article 13.

(32) **An example more of illegal turn over of the jurisdiction**

This part of the Guide contains §73 up to §300 and are in total superfluous. This starts with §73 stating (quote:) "The nature of the right which the authorities are alleged to have violated will have implications for the nature of the remedies under Article 13. (…)" (Kaya v. Turkey, 1998, §107; Yaşa v. Turkey, 1998, §114; Centre for Legal Resources on behalf of Valentin Câmpeanu v. Romania [GC], 2014, §149).".

(33) So the interpreting of other articles and deliberate the applying in article 13 is outside the jurisdiction and an illegal act. Also blending articles with article 13 is equally an illegal manner of work.

(34) Once more points the public scrutiny the ECofHR to the identifier of interpretation that is published at the homepage behind the item 5. Interpretation and opinion are very different. Also to the solitary rights per article of the ECHR, thus the impossibility to create a conjunction. Also to the impossibility to blend articles of the ECHR, this is very different from the requirement of harmony between articles.

The round up of the final conclusions

The Guide is a misleading source for information. Most information is not excavated out of the working papers of the ECHR's author, as is obligated. Successively is the information not the interpreted rights as is mandatory.

Furthermore causes the illegal turn around of jurisdiction (also deciding by opinion) chaos, an overload of unnecessary judgments and a huge multiplication of the reasonable period of time, regarding the 392 judgments and the 45 years for one article only**:** article 13. Nevertheless has the ECofHR still not uncovered that one interpreting institute not at all results in legal certainty and likewise that a unanimous opinion of a constantly changing composition of persons not at all results in unity. To this is piled up that it still not uncovered that the ECHR is a contract of which the Agreements Rights are in each State in a domestic law. To this is again piled up that it still not uncovered that the opinion of each judge is always afterwards and hereby intolerable unfair.

Due to the assistance of a business ("Jurisconsult") is the public scrutiny left out in the Guide.

The ECofHR makes again a disastrous failure with keeping unrecognised that the circa 450 million European citizens compose the public scrutiny unity in being united by respect and obedience for the right of expression as declared by the United Nations. And the ECofHR increases this failure by a second one**:** the abuse of the term "independence". Scrutiny has no likeness at all with dependency. Once more increased by a third disastrous failure**:** to not recognise that the violence in society is nothing more then another language. An other as used by the public scrutiny but both are united to express the theft of our human rights and to get all returned. The ECHR does not restrict the effective remedy in article 13.

The ECofHR makes a fundamental crime by its work acquisition instead of the gaol to become unnecessary due to the peace and trust in the society. There is no activity in applying the ECHR to the national law. Even no activity is recognisable that the ECofHR develops a method of working to achieve this within a reasonable period of time.

Excuses are impossible, also for the ECofHR

(Quote:) "From 1970 to 1984, the workload of such courts had more than doubled, whereas there had been no increase in the number of judges." (*Case of De Cubber v. Belgium, 26 October 1984, §34*). This is no excuse to let violations and infringes to the Human Rights happen en remain happening. The ECofHR agrees and relies (quote:) "The Court recalls that the Contracting States are under the obligation to organise their legal systems "so as to ensure compliance with the requirements of Article 6 para. 1 (art. 6-1)" and a bit further (quote:) "The Court's task is to determine whether the Contracting States have achieved the result called for by the Convention, not to indicate the particular means to be utilised." (*Case of De Cubber v. Belgium, 26 October 1984, §35*). To not value the increase of the workload of courts as an intolerable increase of violations and infringes against the Human Rights by the Contracting State's government and its public services, including the courts and its tribunals or judges, is a fundamental crime in itself. The legal results are explained in the preceding paragraph.

Considering binding force

The Human Rights is an equalising power, nothing more and nothing less. Equal to the European Court of Human Rights, is the public scrutiny instituted by the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms. The author must have implied the equal authority as stated in article 46 to the public scrutiny.

As publicly pronounced by the European Court of Human Rights is the jurisdiction of the public scrutiny, the scrutiny of the judiciary regardless European or national. It is not the task of the public scrutiny to take the place of any court. Neither can any court of a Contracting State unjustifiable refuse to abide the judgment or report of the public scrutiny. The public scrutiny is equal to the European Court in the field of scrutiny a Contracting State's tribunal, judge or court and the European Court of Human Rights.

Legal effects

These legal effects is the execution of the effective remedy of the human right stated in article 13.

Emphatic must now the begging for returning our stolen human rights, stop. **Equal emphatic** must the ignoring of the public scrutiny, stop. Act after the press publishes shall aggravate the theft and ignoring.

The European Court of Human Rights is obliged to equal operate in the unity of the public scrutiny and stop the method of working to create legal uncertainty and legal disorder. A huge amount of judgments is by default discrimination.

Priority for the European Court is to standardize the respect and obedience of the freedom of expression as is declared by the United Nations and firstly for the author of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms. Close followed with the retroactive correction of all judgments, in public.

The European Court ought to recognise the, in this report, supplied elaborations of article 13 and accept this as the cogitation, object and purpose of the author with its expression**:** the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms. In the event of opposition is needed to refute with citations out of the working papers. Like this necessity with interpreting.

Now that the European Court published a Guide it is obligated to correct this good action and firstly stop the wrong and misleading information. Obligated is to quickly publish the innovated Guide with the articles and attached to each article all the interpreted elaborations of the implied or latent rights. And each interpreted right equipped with the case and paragraph reference. A school example is in the public scrutiny's judgment or report of the case of Golder at the site "www.publicscrutiny.nl".

The European Court is urged to standardize a reformat of its judgment so the section that contains considerations starts with the inheritance of all the existing –correct– interpreted rights per involved article. So the collection is updated with each necessary new judgment. Also needs the end expose the identifiers so the public knows by what, an occurred trouble is identified as equal in the same category.

Note:

This public scrutiny's report is cooperative in harmony with the public scrutiny's other reports at this site in section "The Public Scrutinies".