



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

GRAND CHAMBER

CASE OF STANEV v. BULGARIA

(Application no. 36760/06)

JUDGMENT

STRASBOURG

17 January 2012

In the case of Stanev v. Bulgaria,

The European Court of Human Rights, sitting as a Grand Chamber composed of:

Nicolas Bratza, *President*,
Jean-Paul Costa,
Françoise Tulkens,
Josep Casadevall,
Nina Vajić,
Dean Spielmann,
Lech Garlicki,
Khanlar Hajiyev,
Egbert Myjer,
Isabelle Berro-Lefèvre,
Luis López Guerra,
Mirjana Lazarova Trajkovska,
Zdravka Kalaydjieva,
Ganna Yudkivska,
Vincent A. De Gaetano,
Angelika Nußberger,
Julia Laffranque, *judges*,

and Vincent Berger, *Jurisconsult*,

Having deliberated in private on 9 February and 7 December 2011,

Delivers the following judgment, which was adopted on the last-mentioned date:

PROCEDURE

1. The case originated in an application (no. 36760/06) against the Republic of Bulgaria lodged with the Court under Article 34 of the Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms (“the Convention”) by a Bulgarian national, Mr Rusi Kosev Stanev (“the applicant”), on 8 September 2006.

2. The applicant, who had been granted legal aid, was represented by Ms A. Genova, a lawyer practising in Sofia, and Ms V. Lee and Ms L. Nelson, lawyers from the Mental Disability Advocacy Center, a non-governmental organisation based in Budapest. The Bulgarian Government (“the Government”) were represented by their Agents, Ms N. Nikolova and Ms R. Nikolova, of the Ministry of Justice.

3. The applicant complained of his placement in a social care home for people with mental disorders and his inability to obtain permission to leave the home (Article 5 §§ 1, 4 and 5 of the Convention). Relying on Article 3, taken alone and in conjunction with Article 13, he further complained of the

living conditions in the home. He also submitted that he had no access to a court to seek release from partial guardianship (Article 6 of the Convention). Lastly, he alleged that the restrictions resulting from the guardianship regime, including his placement in the home, infringed his right to respect for his private life within the meaning of Article 8 taken alone and in conjunction with Article 13 of the Convention.

4. The application was allocated to the Fifth Section of the Court (Rule 52 § 1 of the Rules of Court). On 29 June 2010, after a hearing on admissibility and the merits had been held on 10 November 2009 (Rule 54 § 3), it was declared admissible by a Chamber of that Section composed of Peer Lorenzen, President, Renate Jaeger, Karel Jungwiert, Rait Maruste, Isabelle Berro-Lefèvre, Mirjana Lazarova Trajkovska, and Zdravka Kalaydjieva, judges, and Claudia Westerdiek, Section Registrar. On 14 September 2010 a Chamber of the same Section, composed of Peer Lorenzen, President, Renate Jaeger, Rait Maruste, Mark Villiger, Isabelle Berro-Lefèvre, Mirjana Lazarova Trajkovska and Zdravka Kalaydjieva, judges, and Claudia Westerdiek, Section Registrar, relinquished jurisdiction in favour of the Grand Chamber, neither of the parties having objected to relinquishment (Article 30 of the Convention and Rule 72).

5. The composition of the Grand Chamber was determined in accordance with the provisions of Article 26 §§ 4 and 5 of the Convention and Rule 24.

6. The applicant and the Government each filed observations on the merits.

7. In addition, third-party comments were received from the non-governmental organisation Interights, which had been given leave by the President to intervene in the written procedure (Article 36 § 2 of the Convention and Rule 44 § 3).

8. A hearing took place in public in the Human Rights Building, Strasbourg, on 9 February 2011 (Rule 59 § 3).

There appeared before the Court:

(a) *for the Government*

Ms N. NIKOLOVA, Ministry of Justice,

Ms R. NIKOLOVA, Ministry of Justice,

Co-Agents;

(b) *for the applicant*

Ms A. GENOVA, lawyer,

Ms V. LEE,

Ms L. NELSON,

Counsel,

Advisers.

The Court heard addresses by them. The applicant was also present.

THE FACTS

I. THE CIRCUMSTANCES OF THE CASE

9. The applicant was born in 1956 in Ruse, where he lived until December 2002 and where his half-sister and his father's second wife, his only close relatives, also live. On 20 December 1990 a panel of occupational physicians declared him unfit to work. The panel found that as a result of being diagnosed with schizophrenia in 1975, the applicant had a 90% degree of disablement but did not require assistance. He is in receipt of an invalidity pension on that account.

A. The applicant's placement under partial guardianship and placement in a social care home for people with mental disorders

10. On an unspecified date in 2000, at the request of the applicant's two relatives, the Ruse regional prosecutor applied to the Ruse Regional Court (*Окръжен съд*) for a declaration of total legal incapacity in respect of the applicant. In a judgment of 20 November 2000, the court declared the applicant to be partially incapacitated on the grounds that he had been suffering from simple schizophrenia since 1975, and that his ability to manage his own affairs and interests and to realise the consequences of his own acts had been impaired. The court found that the applicant's condition was not so serious as to warrant a declaration of total incapacity. It observed, in particular, that during the period from 1975 to 2000 he had been admitted to a psychiatric hospital on several occasions. The court took into account an expert medical report produced in the course of the proceedings and interviewed the applicant. Furthermore, according to certain other people it interviewed, the applicant had sold all his possessions, begged for a living, spent all his money on alcohol and became aggressive whenever he drank.

11. That judgment was upheld in a judgment of 12 April 2001 by the Veliko Tarnovo Court of Appeal (*Апелативен съд*) on an appeal by the applicant, and was subsequently transmitted to the Ruse Municipal Council on 7 June 2001 for the appointment of a guardian.

12. Since the applicant's family members had refused to take on any guardianship responsibilities, on 23 May 2002 the Municipal Council appointed Ms R.P., a council officer, as the applicant's guardian until 31 December 2002.

13. On 29 May 2002 R.P. asked the Ruse social services to place the applicant in a social care home for people with mental disorders. She appended to the application form a series of documents including a psychiatric diagnosis. Social services drew up a welfare report on the applicant, noting on 23 July 2002 that he was suffering from schizophrenia,

that he lived alone in a small, run-down annexe to his half-sister's house and that his half-sister and his father's second wife had stated that they did not wish to act as his guardian. The requirements for placement in a social care home were therefore deemed to be fulfilled.

14. On 10 December 2002 a welfare-placement agreement was signed between R.P. and the social care home for adults with mental disorders near the village of Pastra in the municipality of Rila ("the Pastra social care home"), an institution under the responsibility of the Ministry of Labour and Social Policy. The applicant was not informed of the agreement.

15. Later that day, the applicant was taken by ambulance to the Pastra social care home, some 400 km from Ruse. Before the Court, he stated that he had not been told why he was being placed in the home or for how long; the Government did not dispute this.

16. On 14 December 2002, at the request of the Director of the Pastra social care home, the applicant was registered as having his home address in the municipality of Rila. The residence certificate stated that his address had been changed for the purpose of his "permanent supervision". According to the most recent evidence submitted in February 2011, the applicant was still living in the home at that time.

17. On 9 September 2005 the applicant's lawyer requested the Rila Municipal Council to appoint a guardian for her client. In a letter dated 16 September 2005, she was informed that the Municipal Council had decided on 2 February 2005 to appoint the Director of the Pastra social care home as the applicant's guardian.

B. The applicant's stay in the Pastra social care home

1. Provisions of the placement agreement

18. The agreement signed between the guardian R.P. and the Pastra social care home on 10 December 2002 (see paragraph 14 above) did not mention the applicant's name. It stated that the home was to provide food, clothing, medical services, heating and, obviously, accommodation, in return for payment of an amount determined by law. It appears that the applicant's entire invalidity pension was transferred to the home to cover that amount. The agreement stipulated that 80% of the sum was to be used as payment for the services provided and the remaining 20% put aside for personal expenses. According to the information in the case file, the applicant's invalidity pension, as updated in 2008, amounted to 130 Bulgarian leva (BGN – approximately 65 euros (EUR)). The agreement did not specify the duration of the provision of the services in question.

2. Description of the site

19. The Pastra social care home is located in an isolated area of the Rila mountains in south-west Bulgaria. It is accessible via a dirt track from the village of Pastra, the nearest locality 8 km away.

20. The home, built in the 1920s, comprises three buildings, where its residents, all male, are housed according to the state of their mental health. According to a report produced by the Social Assistance Agency in April 2009, there were seventy-three people living in the home, one was in hospital and two had absconded. Among the residents, twenty-three were entirely lacking legal capacity, two were partially lacking capacity and the others enjoyed full legal capacity. Each building has a yard surrounded by a high metal fence. The applicant was placed in block 3 of the home, reserved for residents with the least serious health problems, who were able to move around the premises and go alone to the nearest village with prior permission.

21. According to the applicant, the home was decaying, dirty and rarely heated in winter and, as a result, he and the other residents were obliged to sleep in their coats during winter. The applicant shared a room measuring 16 sq. m with four other residents and the beds were practically side by side. He had only a bedside table in which to store his clothes, but he preferred to keep them in his bed at night for fear that they might be stolen and replaced with old clothes. The home's residents did not have their own items of clothing because clothes were not returned to the same people after being washed.

3. Diet and hygiene and sanitary conditions

22. The applicant asserted that the food provided at the home was insufficient and of poor quality. He had no say in the choice of meals and was not allowed to help prepare them.

23. Access to the bathroom, which was unhealthy and decrepit, was permitted once a week. The toilets in the courtyard, which were unhygienic and in a very poor state of repair, consisted of holes in the ground covered by dilapidated shelters. Each toilet was shared by at least eight people. Toiletries were available only sporadically.

4. Recent developments

24. In their memorial before the Grand Chamber, the Government stated that renovation work had been carried out in late 2009 in the part of the home where the applicant lived, including the sanitary facilities. The home now had central heating. The diet was varied and regularly included fruit and vegetables as well as meat. Residents had access to television, books and games. The State provided them all with clothes. The applicant did not dispute these assertions.

5. Journeys undertaken by the applicant

25. The home's management kept hold of the applicant's identity papers, allowing him to leave the home only with special permission from the Director. He regularly went to the village of Pastra. It appears that during the visits he mainly provided domestic help to villagers or carried out tasks at the village restaurant.

26. Between 2002 and 2006 the applicant returned to Ruse three times on leave of absence. Each trip was authorised for a period of about ten days. The journey cost BGN 60 (approximately EUR 30), which was paid to the applicant by the home's management.

27. The applicant returned to Pastra before the end of his authorised period of leave after his first two visits to Ruse. According to a statement made by the Director of the home to the public prosecutor's office on an unspecified date, the applicant came back early because he was unable to manage his finances and had no accommodation.

28. The third period of leave was authorised from 15 to 25 September 2006. After the applicant failed to return on the scheduled date, the Director of the home wrote to the Ruse municipal police on 13 October 2006, asking them to search for the applicant and transfer him to Sofia, where employees of the home would be able to collect him and take him back to Pastra. On 19 October 2006 the Ruse police informed the Director that the applicant's whereabouts had been discovered but that the police could not transfer him because he was not the subject of a wanted notice. He was driven back to the social care home on 31 October 2006, apparently by staff of the home.

6. Opportunities for cultural and recreational activities

29. The applicant had access to a television set, several books and a chessboard in a common room at the home until 3 p.m., after which the room was kept locked. The room was not heated in winter and the residents kept their coats, hats and gloves on when inside. No other social, cultural or sports activities were available.

7. Correspondence

30. The applicant submitted that the staff at the social care home had refused to supply him with envelopes for his correspondence and that, as he did not have access to his own money, he could not buy any either. The staff would ask him to give them any sheets of paper he wished to post so that they could put them in envelopes and send them off for him.

8. Medical treatment

31. It appears from a medical certificate of 15 June 2005 (see paragraph 37 below) that, following his placement in the home in 2002, the

applicant was given anti-psychotic medication (carbamazepine (600 mg)) under the monthly supervision of a psychiatrist.

32. In addition, at the Grand Chamber hearing the applicant's representatives stated that their client had been in stable remission since 2006 and had not undergone any psychiatric treatment in recent years.

C. Assessment of the applicant's social skills during his stay in Pastra and conclusions of the psychiatric report drawn up at his lawyer's request

33. Once a year, the Director of the social care home and the home's social worker drew up evaluation reports on the applicant's behaviour and social skills. The reports indicated that the applicant was uncommunicative, preferred to stay on his own rather than join in group activities, refused to take his medication and had no close relatives to visit while on leave of absence. He was not on good terms with his half-sister and nobody was sure whether he had anywhere to live outside the social care home. The reports concluded that it was impossible for the applicant to reintegrate into society, and set the objective of ensuring that he acquired the necessary skills and knowledge for social resettlement and, in the long term, reintegration into his family. It appears that he was never offered any therapy to that end.

34. The case file indicates that in 2005 the applicant's guardian asked the Municipal Council to grant a social allowance to facilitate his reintegration into the community. Further to that request, on 30 December 2005 the municipal social assistance department carried out a "social assessment" (*социална оценка*) of the applicant, which concluded that he was incapable of working, even in a sheltered environment, and had no need for training or retraining, and that in those circumstances he was entitled to a social allowance to cover the costs of his transport, subsistence and medication. On 7 February 2007 the municipal social assistance department granted the applicant a monthly allowance of BGN 16.50 (approximately EUR 8). On 3 February 2009 the allowance was increased to BGN 19.50 (approximately EUR 10).

35. In addition, at his lawyer's request, the applicant was examined on 31 August 2006 by Dr V.S., a different psychiatrist from the one who regularly visited the social care home, and by a psychologist, Ms I.A. The report drawn up on that occasion concluded that the diagnosis of schizophrenia given on 15 June 2005 (see paragraph 37 below) was inaccurate in that the patient did not display all the symptoms of that condition. It stated that, although the applicant had suffered from the condition in the past, he had not shown any signs of aggression at the time of the examination but rather a suspicious attitude and a slight tendency towards "verbal aggression"; that he had not undergone any treatment for the condition between 2002 and 2006; and that his health had visibly

stabilised. The report noted that no risk of deterioration of his mental health had been observed and stated that, in the opinion of the home's Director, the applicant was capable of reintegrating into society.

36. According to the report, the applicant's stay in the Pastra social care home was very damaging to his health and it was desirable that he should leave the home, otherwise he was at risk of developing "institutionalisation syndrome" the longer he stayed there. The report added that it would be more beneficial to his mental health and social development to allow him to integrate into community life with as few restrictions as possible, and that the only aspect to monitor was his tendency towards alcohol abuse, which had been apparent prior to 2002. In the view of the experts who had examined the applicant, the behaviour of an alcohol-dependent person could have similar characteristics to that of a person with schizophrenia; accordingly, vigilance was required in the applicant's case and care should be taken not to confuse the two conditions.

D. The applicant's attempts to obtain release from partial guardianship

37. On 25 November 2004 the applicant, through his lawyer, asked the public prosecutor's office to apply to the Regional Court to have his legal capacity restored. On 2 March 2005 the public prosecutor requested the Pastra social care home to send him a doctor's opinion and other medical certificates concerning the applicant's disorders in preparation for a possible application to the courts for restoration of his legal capacity. Further to that request, the applicant was admitted to a psychiatric hospital from 31 May to 15 June 2005 for a medical assessment. In a certificate issued on the latter date, the doctors attested that the applicant showed symptoms of schizophrenia. As his health had not deteriorated since he had been placed in the home in 2002, the regime to which he was subject there had remained unchanged. He had been on maintenance medication since 2002 under the monthly supervision of a psychiatrist. A psychological examination had revealed that he was agitated, tense and suspicious. His communication skills were poor and he was unaware of his illness. He had said that he wanted to leave the home at all costs. The doctors did not express an opinion either on his capacity for resettlement or on the need to keep him in the Pastra social care home.

38. On 10 August 2005 the regional prosecutor refused to bring an action for restoration of the applicant's legal capacity on the grounds that, in the opinion of the doctors, the Director of the Pastra social care home and the home's social worker, the applicant was unable to cope on his own, and that the home, where he could undergo medical treatment, was the most suitable place for him to live. The applicant's lawyer challenged the refusal to bring the action, arguing that her client should have the opportunity to

assess by himself whether or not, having regard to the living conditions at the home, it was in his interests to remain there. She pointed out that the enforced continuation of his stay in the home, on the pretext of providing him with treatment in his own interests, amounted in practice to a deprivation of liberty, a situation that was unacceptable. A person could not be placed in an institution without his or her consent. In accordance with the legislation in force, anyone under partial guardianship was free to choose his or her place of residence, with the guardian's agreement. The choice of residence was therefore not a matter within the competence of the prosecution service. Despite those objections, the regional prosecutor's refusal was upheld on 11 October 2005 by the appellate prosecutor, and subsequently on 29 November 2005 by the Chief Public Prosecutor's Office at the Supreme Court of Cassation.

39. On 9 September 2005 the applicant, through his lawyer, asked the mayor of Rila to bring a court action for his release from partial guardianship. In a letter of 16 September 2005, the mayor of Rila refused his request, stating that there was no basis for such an action in view of the medical certificate of 15 June 2005, the opinions of the Director and the social worker, and the conclusions reached by the public prosecutor's office. On 28 September 2005 the applicant's lawyer applied to the Dupnitsa District Court for judicial review of the mayor's decision, under Article 115 of the Family Code ("the FC") (see paragraph 49 below). In a letter of 7 October 2005, the District Court stated that since the applicant was partially lacking legal capacity he was required to submit a valid form of authority certifying that his lawyer was representing him, and that it should be specified whether his guardian had intervened in the procedure. On an unspecified date the applicant's lawyer submitted a copy of the form of authority signed by the applicant. She also requested that the guardian join the proceedings as an interested party or that an *ad hoc* representative be appointed. On 18 January 2006 the court held a hearing at which the representative of the mayor of Rila objected that the form of authority was invalid as it had not been countersigned by the guardian. The guardian, who was present at the hearing, stated that he was not opposed to the applicant's application, but that the latter's old-age pension was insufficient to meet his needs and that, accordingly, the Pastra social care home was the best place for him to live.

40. The Dupnitsa District Court gave judgment on 10 March 2006. As to the admissibility of the application for judicial review, it held that, although the applicant had instructed his lawyer to represent him, she was not entitled to act on his behalf since the guardian had not signed the form of authority. However, it held that the guardian's endorsement of the application at the public hearing had validated all the procedural steps taken by the lawyer, and that the application was therefore admissible. As to the merits, the court dismissed the application, finding that the guardian had no legitimate

interest in contesting the mayor's refusal, given that he could apply independently and directly for the applicant to be released from partial guardianship. Since the judgment was not subject to appeal, it became final.

41. Lastly, the applicant asserted that he had made several oral requests to his guardian to apply for his release from partial guardianship and to allow him to leave the home. However, his requests had always been refused.

II. RELEVANT DOMESTIC LAW AND PRACTICE

A. Legal status of persons placed under partial guardianship and their representation before the courts

42. Section 5 of the Persons and Family Act of 9 August 1949 provides that persons who are unable to look after their own interests on account of mental illness or mental deficiency must be entirely deprived of legal capacity and declared legally incapable. Adults with milder forms of such disorders are to be partially incapacitated. Persons who are entirely deprived of legal capacity are placed under full guardianship (*настойничество*), whereas those who are partially incapacitated are placed under partial guardianship (*попечителство* – literally “trusteeship”). In accordance with sections 4 and 5 of the Act, persons under partial guardianship may not perform legal transactions without their guardian's consent. They may, however, carry out ordinary acts forming part of everyday life and have access to the resources obtained in consideration for their work. Accordingly, the guardian of a partially incapacitated person cannot independently perform legal transactions that are binding on that person. This means that contracts signed only by the guardian, without the consent of the person partially lacking legal capacity, are invalid.

43. Under Article 16 § 2 of the Code of Civil Procedure (“the CCP”), persons under full guardianship are represented before the courts by their guardian. Persons under partial guardianship, however, are entitled to take part in court proceedings, but require their guardian's consent. Accordingly, the guardian of a partially incapacitated person does not perform the role of a legal representative. The guardian cannot act on behalf of the person under partial guardianship, but may express agreement or disagreement with the person's individual transactions (Сталев, Ж., *Българско гражданско процесуално право*, София, 2006 г., стр. 171). In particular, a person under partial guardianship may instruct a lawyer provided that the form of authority is signed by the guardian (*ibid.*, стр. 173).

B. Procedure for placement under partial guardianship

44. There are two stages to the procedure for placing a person under partial guardianship: the declaration of partial incapacity and the appointment of a guardian.

1. Declaration of partial incapacity by the courts

45. The first stage involves a judicial procedure which at the material time was governed by Articles 275 to 277 of the 1952 CCP, which have been reproduced unchanged in Articles 336 to 340 of the new 2007 CCP. A declaration of partial incapacity may be sought by the person's spouse or close relatives, by the public prosecutor or by any other interested party. The court reaches its decision after examining the person concerned at a public hearing – or, failing that, after forming a first-hand impression of the person's condition – and interviewing the person's close relatives. If the statements thus obtained are insufficient, the court may have recourse to other evidence, such as an expert medical assessment. According to domestic case-law, an assessment must be ordered where the court is unable to conclude from any other information in the file that the request for deprivation of legal capacity is unfounded (Решение на ВС № 1538 от 21.VIII.1961 г. по гр. д. № 5408/61 г.; Решение на ВС № 593 от 4.III.1967 г. по гр. д. № 3218/1966 г.).

2. Appointment of a guardian by the administrative authorities

46. The second stage involves an administrative procedure for the appointment of a guardian, which at the material time was governed by Chapter X (Articles 109 to 128) of the 1985 FC; these provisions have been reproduced, with only minor amendments, in Articles 153 to 174 of the new 2009 FC. The administrative stage is conducted by an authority referred to as “the guardianship authority”, namely the mayor or any other municipal council officer designated by him or her.

47. The guardian should preferably be appointed from among the relatives of the person concerned who are best able to defend his or her interests.

C. Review of measures taken by the guardian and possibility of replacement

48. Measures taken by the guardian are subject to review by the guardianship authority. At the authority's request, the guardian must report on his or her activities. If any irregularities are observed, the authority may request that they be rectified or may order the suspension of the measures in question (see Articles 126 § 2 and 125 of the 1985 FC, and Articles 170

and 171 §§ 2 and 3, of the 2009 FC). It is unclear from domestic law whether persons under partial guardianship may apply to the mayor individually or through another party to suspend measures taken by the guardian.

49. Decisions by the mayor, as the guardianship authority, and any refusal by the mayor to appoint a guardian or to take other steps provided for in the FC are, for their part, amenable to judicial review. They may be challenged by interested parties or the public prosecutor before the district court, which gives a final decision on the merits (Article 115 of the 1985 FC). This procedure allows close relatives to request a change of guardian in the event of a conflict of interests (Решение на ВС № 1249 от 23.XII.1993 г. по гр. д. № 897/93 г.). According to domestic case-law, fully incapacitated persons are not among the “interested parties” entitled to initiate such proceedings (Определение № 5771 от 11.06.2003 г. на ВАС по адм. д. № 9248/2002). There is no domestic case-law showing that a partially incapacitated person is authorised to do so.

50. Furthermore, the guardianship authority may at any time replace a guardian who fails to discharge his or her duties (Article 113 of the 1985 FC). By Article 116 of the 1985 FC, a person cannot be appointed as a guardian where there is a conflict of interests between that person and the person under partial guardianship. Article 123 of the 1985 FC provides that a deputy guardian is to be appointed where the guardian is unable to discharge his or her duties or where there is a conflict of interests. In both cases, the guardianship authority may also appoint an *ad hoc* representative.

D. Procedure for restoration of legal capacity

51. By virtue of Article 277 of the 1952 CCP, this procedure is similar to the partial-guardianship procedure. It is open to anyone entitled to apply for a person to be placed under partial guardianship, and also to the guardianship authority and the guardian. The above-mentioned provision has been reproduced in Article 340 of the 2007 CCP. On 13 February 1980 the Plenary Supreme Court delivered a decision (no. 5/79) aimed at clarifying certain questions concerning the procedure for deprivation of legal capacity. Paragraph 10 of the decision refers to the procedure for restoration of legal capacity and reads as follows:

“The rules applicable in the procedure for restoration of legal capacity are the same as those governing the procedure for deprivation of capacity (Articles 277 and 275 §§ 1 and 2 of the CCP). The persons who requested the measure or the close relatives are treated as respondent parties in the procedure. There is nothing to prevent the party that applied for a person to be deprived of legal capacity from requesting the termination of the measure if circumstances have changed.

Persons under partial guardianship may request, either individually or with the consent of their guardian, that the measure be lifted. They may also ask the

guardianship authority or the guardianship council to bring an action under Article 277 of the CCP in the regional court which deprived them of legal capacity. In such cases, they must show that the application is in their interests by producing a medical certificate. In the context of such an action, they will be treated as the claimant. Where the guardian of a partially incapacitated person, the guardianship authority or the guardianship council (in the case of a fully incapacitated person) refuses to bring an action for restoration of legal capacity, the incapacitated person may ask the public prosecutor to do so (Постановление № 5/79 от 13.II.1980 г., Пленум на ВС).”

52. In addition, the Government cited a case in which proceedings for the review of the legal status of a person entirely deprived of legal capacity had been instituted at the guardian’s request and the person had been released from guardianship (Решение № 1301 от 12.11.2008 г. на ВКС по гр. Д. № 5560/2007 г., V г.о.).

E. Validity of contracts signed by representatives of incapacitated persons

53. Section 26(2) of the Obligations and Contracts Act 1950 provides that contracts that are in breach of the law or have been entered into in the absence of consent are deemed null and void.

54. In accordance with section 27 of the same Act, contracts entered into by representatives of persons deprived of legal capacity in breach of the applicable rules are deemed voidable. A ground of incurable nullity may be raised on any occasion, whereas a ground of voidability may be raised only by means of a court action. The right to raise a ground of voidability becomes time-barred after a period of three years from the date of release from partial guardianship if a guardian is not appointed. In other cases, the period in question begins to run from the date on which a guardian is appointed (section 32(2), in conjunction with section 115(1)(e), of the above-mentioned Act; see also Решение на ВС № 668 от 14.III.1963 г. по гр. д. № 250/63 г., I г. о., Решение на Окръжен съд – Стара Загора от 2.2.2010 г. по т. д. № 381/2009 г. на I състав, Решение на Районен съд Стара Загора № 459 от 19.5.2009 г. по гр. д. № 1087/2008).

F. Place of residence of legally incapacitated persons

55. By virtue of Articles 120 and 122 § 3 of the 1985 FC, persons deprived of legal capacity are deemed to reside at the home address of their guardian unless “exceptional reasons” require them to live elsewhere. Where the place of residence is changed without the guardian’s consent, the guardian may request the district court to order the person’s return to the official address. By Article 163 §§ 2 and 3 of the 2009 FC, before reaching a decision in such cases, the court is required to interview the person under guardianship. If it finds that there are “exceptional reasons”, it must refuse

to order the person's return and must immediately inform the municipal social assistance department so that protective measures can be taken.

56. The district court's order may be appealed against to the president of the regional court, although its execution cannot be stayed.

G. Placement of legally incapacitated persons in social care homes for adults with mental disorders

57. Under the Social Assistance Act 1998, social assistance is available to people who, for medical and social reasons, are incapable of meeting their basic needs on their own through work, through their own assets or with the help of persons required by law to care for them (section 2 of the Act). Social assistance consists of the provision of various financial benefits, benefits in kind and social services, including placement in specialised institutions. Such benefits are granted on the basis of an individual assessment of the needs of the persons concerned and in accordance with their wishes and personal choices (section 16(2)).

58. By virtue of the implementing regulations for the Social Assistance Act 1998 (*Правилник за прилагане на Закона за социално подпомагане*), three categories of institutions are defined as "specialised institutions" for the provision of social services: (1) children's homes (homes for children deprived of parental care, homes for children with physical disabilities, homes for children with a mental deficiency); (2) homes for adults with disabilities (homes for adults with a mental deficiency, homes for adults with mental disorders, homes for adults with physical disabilities, homes for adults with sensory disorders, homes for adults with dementia); and (3) old people's homes (Regulation 36(3)). Social services are provided in specialised institutions where it is no longer possible to receive them in the community (Regulation 36(4)). Under domestic law, placement of a legally incapacitated person in a social care home is not regarded as a form of deprivation of liberty.

59. Similarly, in accordance with Decree no. 4 of 16 March 1999 on the conditions for obtaining social services (*Наредба № 4 за условията и реда за извършване на социални услуги*), adults with mental deficiencies are placed in specialised social care homes if it is impossible to provide them with the necessary medical care in a family environment (Articles 12, point (4), and 27 of the Decree). Article 33 § 1, point (3), of the Decree provides that when a person is placed in a social care home, a medical certificate concerning the person's state of health must be produced. By Article 37 § 1 of the Decree, a placement agreement for the provision of social services is signed between the specialised institution and the person concerned or his or her legal representative, on the basis of a model approved by the Ministry of Labour and Social Policy. The person may be transferred to another home or may leave the institution in which he or she has been placed: (1) at his or

her request or at the request of his or her legal representative, submitted in writing to the director of the institution; (2) if there is a change in the state of his or her mental and/or physical health such that it no longer corresponds to the profile of the home; (3) in the event of failure to pay the monthly social welfare contribution for more than one month; (4) in the event of systematic breaches of the institution's internal rules; or (5) in the event of a confirmed addiction to narcotic substances.

60. Furthermore, the system governing admission to a psychiatric hospital for compulsory medical treatment is set out in the Health Act 2005, which replaced the Public Health Act 1973.

H. Appointment of an *ad hoc* representative in the event of a conflict of interests

61. Article 16 § 6 of the CCP provides that, in the event of a conflict of interests between a person being represented and the representative, the court is to appoint an *ad hoc* representative. The Bulgarian courts have applied this provision in certain situations involving a conflict of interests between minors and their legal representative. Thus, the failure to appoint an *ad hoc* representative has been found to amount to a substantial breach of the rules governing paternity proceedings (Решение на ВС № 297 от 15.04.1987 г. по гр. д. № 168/87 г., II г. о.), disputes between adoptive and biological parents (Решение на ВС № 1381 от 10.05.1982 г. по гр. д. № 954/82 г., II г. о.) or property disputes (Решение № 643 от 27.07.2000 г. на ВКС по гр. д. № 27/2000 г., II г. о.; Определение на ОС – Велико Търново от 5.11.2008 г. по в. ч. гр. д. № 963/2008).

I. State liability

62. The State and Municipalities Responsibility for Damage Act 1988 (*Закон за отговорността на държавата и общините за вреди* – title amended in 2006) provides in section 2(1) that the State is liable for damage caused to private individuals as a result of a judicial decision ordering certain types of detention where the decision has been set aside as having no legal basis.

63. Section 1(1) of the same Act provides that the State and municipalities are liable for damage caused to private individuals and other legal entities as a result of unlawful decisions, acts or omissions by their own authorities or officials while discharging their administrative duties.

64. In a number of decisions, various domestic courts have found this provision to be applicable to the damage suffered by prisoners as a result of poor conditions or inadequate medical treatment in prison and have, where appropriate, partly or fully upheld claims for compensation brought by the

persons concerned (реш. от 26.01.2004 г. по гр. д. № 959/2003, БКС, IV г. о. and реш. № 330 от 7.08.2007 г. по гр. д. № 92/2006, БКС, IV г. о.).

65. There are no court decisions in which the above position has been found to apply to allegations of poor living conditions in social care homes.

66. Moreover, it appears from the domestic courts' case-law that, under section 1(1) of the Act in question, anyone whose health has deteriorated because bodies under the authority of the Ministry of Health have failed in their duty to provide a regular supply of medication may hold the administrative authorities liable and receive compensation (реш. № 211 от 27.05.2008 г. по гр. д. № 6087/2007, БКС, V г. о.).

67. Lastly, the State and its authorities are subject to the ordinary rules on tortious liability for other forms of damage resulting, for example, from the death of a person under guardianship while absconding from a social care home for adults with a mental deficiency, on the ground that the staff of the home had failed to discharge their duty of permanent supervision (реш. № 693 от 26.06.2009 г. по гр. д. № 8/2009, БКС, III г. о.).

J. Arrest by the police under the Ministry of the Interior Act 2006

68. Under this Act, the police are, *inter alia*, authorised to arrest anyone who, on account of severe mental disturbance and through his or her conduct, poses a threat to public order or puts his or her own life in manifest danger (section 63(1)-(3)). The person concerned may challenge the lawfulness of the arrest before a court, which must give an immediate ruling (section 63(4)).

69. Furthermore, the police's responsibilities include searching for missing persons (section 139(3)).

K. Information submitted by the applicant about searches for persons who have absconded from social care homes for adults with mental disorders

70. The Bulgarian Helsinki Committee conducted a survey of police stations regarding searches for people who had absconded from social care homes of this type. It appears from the survey that there is no uniform practice. Some police officers said that when they were asked by employees of a home to search for a missing person, they carried out the search and took the person to the police station, before informing the home. Other officers explained that they searched for the person but, not being empowered to perform an arrest, simply notified the staff of the home, who took the person back themselves.

L. Statistics submitted by the applicant on judicial proceedings concerning deprivation of legal capacity

71. The Bulgarian Helsinki Committee obtained statistics from 8 regional courts on the outcome of proceedings for restoration of legal capacity between January 2002 and September 2009. During this period 677 persons were deprived of legal capacity. Proceedings to restore capacity were instituted in 36 cases: 10 of them ended with the lifting of the measure; total incapacitation was changed to partial incapacitation in 8 cases; the applications were rejected in 4 cases; the courts discontinued the proceedings in 7 cases; and the other cases are still pending.

III. RELEVANT INTERNATIONAL INSTRUMENTS

A. Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, adopted by the United Nations General Assembly on 13 December 2006 (Resolution A/RES/61/106)

72. This convention came into force on 3 May 2008. It was signed by Bulgaria on 27 September 2007 but has yet to be ratified. The relevant parts of the Convention provide:

Article 12

Equal recognition before the law

“1. States Parties reaffirm that persons with disabilities have the right to recognition everywhere as persons before the law.

2. States Parties shall recognize that persons with disabilities enjoy legal capacity on an equal basis with others in all aspects of life.

3. States Parties shall take appropriate measures to provide access by persons with disabilities to the support they may require in exercising their legal capacity.

4. States Parties shall ensure that all measures that relate to the exercise of legal capacity provide for appropriate and effective safeguards to prevent abuse in accordance with international human rights law. Such safeguards shall ensure that measures relating to the exercise of legal capacity respect the rights, will and preferences of the person, are free of conflict of interest and undue influence, are proportional and tailored to the person's circumstances, apply for the shortest time possible and are subject to regular review by a competent, independent and impartial authority or judicial body. The safeguards shall be proportional to the degree to which such measures affect the person's rights and interests.

5. Subject to the provisions of this Article, States Parties shall take all appropriate and effective measures to ensure the equal right of persons with disabilities to own or inherit property, to control their own financial affairs and to have equal access to bank loans, mortgages and other forms of financial credit, and shall ensure that persons with disabilities are not arbitrarily deprived of their property.”

Article 14
Liberty and security of person

“1. States Parties shall ensure that persons with disabilities, on an equal basis with others:

(a) Enjoy the right to liberty and security of person;

(b) Are not deprived of their liberty unlawfully or arbitrarily, and that any deprivation of liberty is in conformity with the law, and that the existence of a disability shall in no case justify a deprivation of liberty.

2. States Parties shall ensure that if persons with disabilities are deprived of their liberty through any process, they are, on an equal basis with others, entitled to guarantees in accordance with international human rights law and shall be treated in compliance with the objectives and principles of the present Convention, including by provision of reasonable accommodation.”

B. Recommendation No. R (99) 4 of the Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe on principles concerning the legal protection of incapable adults (adopted on 23 February 1999)

73. The relevant parts of this Recommendation read as follows.

Principle 2 – Flexibility in legal response

“1. The measures of protection and other legal arrangements available for the protection of the personal and economic interests of incapable adults should be sufficient, in scope or flexibility, to enable suitable legal response to be made to different degrees of incapacity and various situations.

...

4. The range of measures of protection should include, in appropriate cases, those which do not restrict the legal capacity of the person concerned.”

Principle 3 – Maximum preservation of capacity

“1. The legislative framework should, so far as possible, recognise that different degrees of incapacity may exist and that incapacity may vary from time to time. Accordingly, a measure of protection should not result automatically in a complete removal of legal capacity. However, a restriction of legal capacity should be possible where it is shown to be necessary for the protection of the person concerned.

2. In particular, a measure of protection should not automatically deprive the person concerned of the right to vote, or to make a will, or to consent or refuse consent to any intervention in the health field, or to make other decisions of a personal character at any time when his or her capacity permits him or her to do so.

...”

Principle 6 – Proportionality

“1. Where a measure of protection is necessary it should be proportional to the degree of capacity of the person concerned and tailored to the individual circumstances and needs of the person concerned.

2. The measure of protection should interfere with the legal capacity, rights and freedoms of the person concerned to the minimum extent which is consistent with achieving the purpose of the intervention.”

Principle 13 – Right to be heard in person

“The person concerned should have the right to be heard in person in any proceedings which could affect his or her legal capacity.”

Principle 14 – Duration, review and appeal

“1. Measures of protection should, whenever possible and appropriate, be of limited duration. Consideration should be given to the institution of periodical reviews.

...

3. There should be adequate rights of appeal.”

C. Reports on visits to Bulgaria by the European Committee for the Prevention of Torture and Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment (CPT)

1. The CPT’s report on its visit from 16 to 22 December 2003, published on 24 June 2004

74. This report outlines the situation of persons placed by the public authorities in social care homes for people with mental disorders or mental deficiency, which are under the authority of the Ministry of Labour and Social Policy. Part II.4 of the report is devoted to the Pastra social care home.

75. The CPT noted that the home’s official capacity was 105; it had 92 registered male residents, of whom 86 were present at the time of the visit. Two residents had absconded and the others were on home leave. Some 90% of the residents were suffering from schizophrenia and the remainder had a mental deficiency. The majority had spent many years in the institution, discharges being quite uncommon.

76. According to the CPT’s findings, the premises of the Pastra social care home were in a deplorable state of repair and hygiene and the home was inadequately heated.

77. In particular, the buildings did not have running water. The residents washed in cold water in the yard and were often unshaven and dirty. The bathroom, to which they had access once a week, was rudimentary and dilapidated.

78. The toilets, likewise located in the yard, consisted of decrepit shelters with holes dug in the ground. They were in an execrable state and access to them was dangerous. Furthermore, basic toiletries were rarely available.

79. The report notes that the provision of food was inadequate. Residents received three meals a day, including 750 g of bread. Milk and

eggs were never on offer, and fresh fruit and vegetables were rarely available. No provision was made for special diets.

80. The only form of treatment at the home consisted of the provision of medication. The residents, who were treated as chronic psychiatric patients in need of maintenance therapy, were registered as outpatients with a psychiatrist in Dupnitsa. The psychiatrist visited the home once every two to three months, and also on request. In addition, residents could be taken to the psychiatrist – who held weekly surgeries in the nearby town of Rila – if changes in their mental condition were observed. All residents underwent a psychiatric examination twice a year, which was an occasion for them to have their medication reviewed and, if necessary, adjusted. Nearly all residents received psychiatric medication, which was recorded on a special card and administered by the nurses.

81. Apart from the administration of medication, no therapeutic activities were organised for residents, who led passive, monotonous lives.

82. The CPT concluded that these conditions had created a situation which could be said to amount to inhuman and degrading treatment. It requested the Bulgarian authorities to replace the Pastra social care home as a matter of urgency. In their response of 13 February 2004, the Bulgarian authorities acknowledged that the home was not in conformity with European care standards. They stated that it would be closed as a priority and that the residents would be transferred to other institutions.

83. The CPT further observed, in part II.7 of its report, that in most cases placement of people with mental disabilities in a specialised institution led to a *de facto* deprivation of liberty. The placement procedure should therefore be accompanied by appropriate safeguards, among them an objective medical, and in particular psychiatric, assessment. It was also essential that these persons should have the right to bring proceedings by which the lawfulness of their placement could be decided speedily by a court. The CPT recommended that such a right be guaranteed in Bulgaria (see paragraph 52 of the report).

2. The CPT's report on its visit from 10 to 21 September 2006, published on 28 February 2008

84. In this report the CPT again recommended that provision be made for the introduction of judicial review of the lawfulness of placement in a social care home (see paragraphs 176-77 of the report).

85. It also recommended that efforts be made to ensure that the placement of residents in homes for people with mental disorders and/or deficiency conformed fully to the letter and spirit of the law. Contracts for the provision of social services should specify the legal rights of residents, including the possibilities for lodging complaints with an outside authority. Furthermore, residents who were incapable of understanding the contracts should receive appropriate assistance (see paragraph 178 of the report).

86. Lastly, the CPT urged the Bulgarian authorities to take the necessary steps to avoid conflicts of interests arising from the appointment of an employee of a social care home as the guardian of a resident of the same institution (see paragraph 179 of the report).

87. The CPT made a further visit to the Pastra social care home during its periodic visit to Bulgaria in October 2010.

IV. COMPARATIVE LAW

A. Access to a court for restoration of legal capacity

88. A comparative study of the domestic law of twenty Council of Europe member States indicates that in the vast majority of cases (Croatia, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Luxembourg, Monaco, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Slovakia, Sweden, Switzerland and Turkey) the law entitles anyone who has been deprived of legal capacity to apply directly to the courts for discontinuation of the measure.

89. In Ukraine, people who have been partially deprived of legal capacity may themselves apply for the measure to be lifted; this does not apply to those who have been declared fully incapable, who may nevertheless challenge before a court any measures taken by their guardian.

90. Judicial proceedings for the discontinuation of an order depriving a person of legal capacity cannot be instituted directly by the person concerned in Latvia (where an application may be made by the public prosecutor or the guardianship council) or in Ireland.

B. Placement of legally incapacitated persons in a specialised institution

91. A comparative-law study of the legislation of twenty States Parties to the Convention shows that there is no uniform approach in Europe to the question of placement of legally incapacitated persons in specialised institutions, particularly as regards the authority competent to order the placement and the guarantees afforded to the person concerned. It may nevertheless be observed that in some countries (Austria, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Poland, Portugal and Turkey) the decision to place a person in a home on a long-term basis against his or her will is taken directly or approved by a judge.

92. Other legal systems (Belgium, Denmark, Hungary, Ireland, Latvia, Luxembourg, Monaco and the United Kingdom) authorise the guardian, close relatives or the administrative authorities to decide on placement in a specialised institution without a judge's approval being necessary. It also

appears that in all the above-mentioned countries, the placement is subject to a number of substantive requirements, relating in particular to the person's health, the existence of a danger or risk and/or the production of medical certificates. In addition, the obligation to interview or consult the person concerned on the subject of the placement, the setting of a time-limit by law or by the courts for the termination or review of the placement, and the possibility of legal assistance are among the safeguards provided in several national legal systems.

93. In certain countries (Denmark, Estonia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Ireland, Latvia, Poland, Slovakia, Switzerland and Turkey) the possibility of challenging the initial placement order before a judicial body is available to the person concerned without requiring the guardian's consent.

94. Lastly, several States (Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Germany, Greece, Ireland, Latvia, Poland, Switzerland and Turkey) directly empower the person concerned to apply periodically for judicial review of the lawfulness of the continued placement.

95. It should also be noted that many countries' laws on legal capacity or placement in specialised institutions have recently been amended (Austria: 2007; Denmark: 2007; Estonia: 2005; Finland: 1999; France: 2007; Germany: 1992; Greece: 1992; Hungary: 2004; Latvia: 2006; Poland: 2007; Ukraine: 2000; United Kingdom: 2005) or are in the process of being amended (Ireland). These legislative reforms are designed to increase the legal protection of persons lacking legal capacity by affording them either the right of direct access to court for a review of their status, or additional safeguards when they are placed in specialised institutions against their will.

THE LAW

I. ALLEGED VIOLATION OF ARTICLE 5 § 1 OF THE CONVENTION

96. The applicant submitted that his placement in the Pastra social care home was in breach of Article 5 § 1 of the Convention.

Article 5 § 1 provides:

“1. Everyone has the right to liberty and security of person. No one shall be deprived of his liberty save in the following cases and in accordance with a procedure prescribed by law:

- (a) the lawful detention of a person after conviction by a competent court;
- (b) the lawful arrest or detention of a person for non-compliance with the lawful order of a court or in order to secure the fulfilment of any obligation prescribed by law;
- (c) the lawful arrest or detention of a person effected for the purpose of bringing him before the competent legal authority on reasonable suspicion of having

committed an offence or when it is reasonably considered necessary to prevent his committing an offence or fleeing after having done so;

(d) the detention of a minor by lawful order for the purpose of educational supervision or his lawful detention for the purpose of bringing him before the competent legal authority;

(e) the lawful detention of persons for the prevention of the spreading of infectious diseases, of persons of unsound mind, alcoholics or drug addicts or vagrants;

(f) the lawful arrest or detention of a person to prevent his effecting an unauthorised entry into the country or of a person against whom action is being taken with a view to deportation or extradition.”

A. Preliminary remarks

97. The Grand Chamber observes that the Government maintained before it the objection they raised before the Chamber, alleging failure to exhaust domestic remedies in respect of the complaint under Article 5 § 1.

98. The objection was based on the following arguments. Firstly, the applicant could at any time have applied personally to a court for restoration of his legal capacity, under Article 277 of the Code of Civil Procedure (“the CCP”), and release from guardianship would have allowed him to leave the home of his own accord. Secondly, his close relatives had not availed themselves of the possibility open to some of them, under Articles 113 and 115 of the Family Code (“the FC”), of asking the guardianship authority to replace his guardian. According to the Government, in the event of a refusal the applicants’ relatives could have applied to a court, which would have considered the merits of the request and, if appropriate, appointed a new guardian, who would then have been able to terminate the placement agreement. The Government also submitted in substance that the applicant’s close relatives could have challenged the contract signed between the guardian R.P. and the Pastra social care home. Lastly, they indicated that the applicant himself could have requested the guardianship authority to appoint an *ad hoc* representative on account of his alleged conflict of interests with his guardian, with a view to requesting to leave the institution and establish his home elsewhere (Article 123 § 1 of the FC).

99. The Grand Chamber observes that in its admissibility decision of 29 June 2010 the Chamber found that this objection raised questions that were closely linked to those arising in relation to the applicant’s complaint under Article 5 § 4 and therefore joined the objection to its examination of the merits under that provision.

100. In addition, finding that the question whether there had been a “deprivation of liberty” within the meaning of Article 5 § 1 in the present case was closely linked to the merits of the complaint under that provision, the Chamber likewise joined that issue to its examination of the merits. The

Grand Chamber sees no reason to call into question the Chamber's findings on these issues.

B. Whether the applicant was deprived of his liberty within the meaning of Article 5 § 1

1. The parties' submissions

(a) The applicant

101. The applicant contended that, although under domestic law placement of people with mental disorders in a social care institution was regarded as "voluntary", his transfer to the Pastra social care home constituted a deprivation of liberty. He maintained that, as in *Storck v. Germany* (no. 61603/00, ECHR 2005-V), the objective and subjective elements of detention were present in his case.

102. With regard to the nature of the measure, the applicant submitted that living in a social care home in a remote mountain location amounted to physical isolation from society. He could not have chosen to leave on his own initiative since, having no identity papers or money, he would soon have faced the risk of being stopped by the police for a routine check, a widespread practice in Bulgaria.

103. Absences from the social care home were subject to permission. The distance of approximately 420 km between the institution and his home town and the fact that he had no access to his invalidity pension had made it impossible for him to travel to Ruse more than three times. The applicant further submitted that he had been denied permission to travel on many other occasions by the home's management. He added that, in accordance with a practice with no legal basis, residents who left the premises for longer than the authorised period were treated as fugitives and were searched for by the police. He stated in that connection that on one occasion the police had arrested him in Ruse and that, although they had not taken him back to the home, the fact that the Director had asked for him to be located and transferred back had amounted to a decisive restriction on his right to personal liberty. He stated that he had been arrested and detained by the police pending the arrival of staff from the home to collect him, without being informed of the grounds for depriving him of his liberty. Since he had been transferred back under duress, it was immaterial that those involved had been employees of the home.

104. The applicant further noted that his placement in the home had already lasted more than eight years and that his hopes of leaving one day were futile, as the decision had to be approved by his guardian.

105. As to the consequences of his placement, the applicant highlighted the severity of the regime to which he was subject. His occupational activities, treatment and movements had been subject to thorough and

practical supervision by the home's employees. He had been required to follow a strict daily routine, getting up, going to bed and eating at set times. He had had no free choice as to his clothing, the preparation of his meals, participation in cultural events or the development of relations with other people, including intimate relationships as the home's residents were all men. He had been allowed to watch television in the morning only. Accordingly, his stay in the home had caused a perceptible deterioration in his well-being and the onset of institutionalisation syndrome, in other words the inability to reintegrate into the community and lead a normal life.

106. With regard to the subjective element, the applicant submitted that his situation differed from that examined in *H.M. v. Switzerland* (no. 39187/98, ECHR 2002-II), in which the applicant had consented to her placement in a nursing home. He himself had never given such consent. His guardian at the time, Ms R.P. (see paragraph 12 above), had not consulted him on the placement and, moreover, he did not even know her; nor had he been informed of the existence of the placement agreement of 10 December 2002 (see paragraph 14 above), which he had never signed. Those circumstances reflected a widespread practice in Bulgaria whereby once people were deprived of legal capacity, even partially, they were deemed incapable of expressing their wishes. In addition, it was clear from the medical documents that the applicant's desire to leave the home had been interpreted not as a freely expressed wish, but rather as a symptom of his mental illness.

107. Lastly, in *H.M. v. Switzerland* (cited above) the authorities had based their decision to place the applicant in a nursing home on a thorough examination showing that the living conditions in her own home had severely deteriorated as a result of her lack of cooperation with a social welfare authority. By contrast, the applicant in the present case had never been offered and had never refused alternative social care at home.

(b) The Government

108. In their written observations before the Chamber, the Government accepted that the circumstances of the case amounted to a "deprivation of liberty" within the meaning of Article 5 § 1 of the Convention. However, at the hearing and in the proceedings before the Grand Chamber, they contended that Article 5 was not applicable. They observed in that connection that the applicant had not been compulsorily admitted to a psychiatric institution by the public authorities under the Public Health Act, but had been housed in a social care home at his guardian's request, on the basis of a civil-law agreement and in accordance with the rules on social assistance. Thus, persons in need of assistance, including those with mental disorders, could request various social and medical services, either directly or through their representatives, under the Social Assistance Act 1998 (see paragraphs 57-60 above). Homes for adults with mental disorders offered a

wide range of services of this kind and placement in such institutions could not be seen as a deprivation of liberty.

109. As to the particular circumstances of the case, the Government emphasised that the applicant had never expressly and consciously objected to his placement in the home, and it could not therefore be concluded that the measure had been involuntary. Furthermore, he had been free to leave the home at any time.

110. In addition, the applicant had been encouraged to work in the village restaurant to the best of his abilities and had been granted leave of absence on three occasions. The reason he had twice returned from Ruse before the end of his authorised period of leave (see paragraph 27 above) was his lack of accommodation. The Government further submitted that the applicant had never been brought back to the home by the police. They acknowledged that in September 2006 the Director had been obliged to ask the police to search for him because he had not come back (see paragraph 28 above). However, it was clear from the case of *Dodov v. Bulgaria* (no. 59548/00, 17 January 2008) that the State had a positive obligation to take care of people housed in social care homes. In the Government's submission, the steps taken by the Director had formed part of this duty of protection.

111. The Government further observed that the applicant had lacked legal capacity and had not had the benefit of a supportive family environment, accommodation or sufficient resources to lead an independent life. Referring in that connection to the judgments in *H.M. v. Switzerland* (cited above) and *Nielsen v. Denmark* (28 November 1988, Series A no. 144), they submitted that the applicant's placement in the home was simply a protective measure taken in his interests alone and constituted an appropriate response to a social and medical emergency; such a response could not be viewed as involuntary.

(c) The third party

112. Interights made the following general observations. It stated that it had carried out a survey of practices regarding placement of people with mental disorders in specialised institutions in central and east European countries. According to the conclusions of the survey, in most cases placement in such institutions could be regarded as amounting to a *de facto* deprivation of liberty.

113. Social care homes were often located in rural or mountainous areas which were not easily accessible. Where they were situated near urban areas, they were surrounded by high walls or fences and the gates were kept locked. As a rule, residents were able to leave the premises only with the express permission of the director of the home, and for a limited period. In cases of unauthorised leave, the police had the power to search for and return the persons concerned. The same restrictive regime applied to all

residents, without any distinction according to legal status – whether they had full, partial or no legal capacity – and in the view of Interights this was a decisive factor. No consideration at all was given to whether the placement was voluntary or involuntary.

114. Regarding the analysis of the subjective aspect of the placement, Interights submitted that the consent of the persons concerned was a matter requiring careful attention. Thorough efforts should be made to ascertain their true wishes, notwithstanding any declaration of legal incapacity that might have been made in their case. Interights contended that in reality, when faced with a choice between a precarious, homeless existence and the relative security offered by a social care home, incapable persons in central and east European countries might opt for the latter solution, simply because no alternative services were offered by the State's social welfare system. That did not mean, however, that the persons concerned could be said to have freely consented to the placement.

2. *The Court's assessment*

(a) **General principles**

115. The Court reiterates that the difference between deprivation of liberty and restrictions on liberty of movement, the latter being governed by Article 2 of Protocol No. 4, is merely one of degree or intensity, and not one of nature or substance. Although the process of classification into one or other of these categories sometimes proves to be no easy task in that some borderline cases are a matter of pure opinion, the Court cannot avoid making the selection upon which the applicability or inapplicability of Article 5 depends (see *Guzzardi v. Italy*, 6 November 1980, §§ 92-93, Series A no. 39). In order to determine whether someone has been deprived of his liberty, the starting-point must be his specific situation and account must be taken of a whole range of factors such as the type, duration, effects and manner of implementation of the measure in question (see *Storck*, cited above, § 71, and *Guzzardi*, cited above, § 92).

116. In the context of deprivation of liberty on mental-health grounds, the Court has held that a person could be regarded as having been “detained” even during a period when he was in an open hospital ward with regular unescorted access to the unsecured hospital grounds and the possibility of unescorted leave outside the hospital (see *Ashingdane v. the United Kingdom*, 28 May 1985, § 42, Series A no. 93).

117. Furthermore, in relation to the placement of mentally disordered persons in an institution, the Court has held that the notion of deprivation of liberty does not only comprise the objective element of a person's confinement in a particular restricted space for a not negligible length of time. A person can only be considered to have been deprived of his liberty

if, as an additional subjective element, he has not validly consented to the confinement in question (see *Storck*, cited above, § 74).

118. The Court has found that there was a deprivation of liberty in circumstances such as the following: (a) where the applicant, who had been declared legally incapable and admitted to a psychiatric hospital at his legal representative's request, had unsuccessfully attempted to leave the hospital (see *Shtukurov v. Russia*, no. 44009/05, § 108, ECHR 2008); (b) where the applicant had initially consented to her admission to a clinic but had subsequently attempted to escape (see *Storck*, cited above, § 76); and (c) where the applicant was an adult incapable of giving his consent to admission to a psychiatric institution which, nonetheless, he had never attempted to leave (see *H.L. v. the United Kingdom*, no. 45508/99, §§ 89-94, ECHR 2004-IX).

119. The Court has also held that the right to liberty is too important in a democratic society for a person to lose the benefit of Convention protection for the single reason that he may have given himself up to be taken into detention (see *De Wilde, Ooms and Versyp v. Belgium*, 18 June 1971, §§ 64-65, Series A no. 12), especially when it is not disputed that that person is legally incapable of consenting to, or disagreeing with, the proposed action (see *H.L. v. the United Kingdom*, cited above, § 90).

120. In addition, the Court has had occasion to observe that the first sentence of Article 5 § 1 must be construed as laying down a positive obligation on the State to protect the liberty of those within its jurisdiction. Otherwise, there would be a sizeable gap in the protection from arbitrary detention, which would be inconsistent with the importance of personal liberty in a democratic society. The State is therefore obliged to take measures providing effective protection of vulnerable persons, including reasonable steps to prevent a deprivation of liberty of which the authorities have or ought to have knowledge (see *Storck*, cited above, § 102). Thus, having regard to the particular circumstances of the cases before it, the Court has held that the national authorities' responsibility was engaged as a result of detention in a psychiatric hospital at the request of the applicant's guardian (see *Shtukurov*, cited above) and detention in a private clinic (see *Storck*, cited above).

(b) Application of these principles in the present case

121. The Court observes at the outset that it is unnecessary in the present case to determine whether, in general terms, any placement of a legally incapacitated person in a social care institution constitutes a "deprivation of liberty" within the meaning of Article 5 § 1. In some cases, the placement is initiated by families who are also involved in the guardianship arrangements and is based on civil-law agreements signed with an appropriate social care institution. Accordingly, any restrictions on liberty in such cases are the result of actions by private individuals and the authorities' role is limited to

supervision. The Court is not called upon in the present case to rule on the obligations that may arise under the Convention for the authorities in such situations.

122. It observes that there are special circumstances in the present case. No members of the applicant's family were involved in his guardianship arrangements, and the duties of guardian were assigned to a State official (Ms R.P.), who negotiated and signed the placement agreement with the Pastra social care home without any contact with the applicant, whom she had in fact never met. The placement agreement was implemented in a State-run institution by social services, which likewise did not interview the applicant (see paragraphs 12-15 above). The applicant was never consulted about his guardian's choices, even though he could have expressed a valid opinion and his consent was necessary in accordance with the Persons and Family Act 1949 (see paragraph 42 above). That being so, he was not transferred to the Pastra social care home at his request or on the basis of a voluntary private-law agreement on admission to an institution to receive social assistance and protection. The Court considers that the restrictions complained of by the applicant are the result of various steps taken by public authorities and institutions through their officials, from the initial request for his placement in an institution and throughout the implementation of the relevant measure, and not of acts or initiatives by private individuals. Although there is no indication that the applicant's guardian acted in bad faith, the above considerations set the present case apart from *Nielsen* (cited above), in which the applicant's mother committed her son, a minor, to a psychiatric institution in good faith, which prompted the Court to find that the measure in question entailed the exercise of exclusive custodial rights over a child who was not capable of expressing a valid opinion.

123. The applicant's placement in the social care home can therefore be said to have been attributable to the national authorities. It remains to be determined whether the restrictions resulting from that measure amounted to a "deprivation of liberty" within the meaning of Article 5.

124. With regard to the objective aspect, the Court observes that the applicant was housed in a block which he was able to leave, but emphasises that the question whether the building was locked is not decisive (see *Ashingdane*, cited above, § 42). While it is true that the applicant was able to go to the nearest village, he needed express permission to do so (see paragraph 25 above). Moreover, the time he spent away from the home and the places where he could go were always subject to controls and restrictions.

125. The Court further notes that between 2002 and 2009 the applicant was granted leave of absence for three short visits (of about ten days) to Ruse (see paragraphs 26-28 above). It cannot speculate as to whether he could have made more frequent visits had he asked to do so. Nevertheless, it

observes that such leave of absence was entirely at the discretion of the home's management, who kept the applicant's identity papers and administered his finances, including transport costs (see paragraphs 25-26 above). Furthermore, it would appear to the Court that the home's location in a mountain region far away from Ruse (some 400 km) made any journey difficult and expensive for the applicant in view of his income and his ability to make his own travel arrangements.

126. The Court considers that this system of leave of absence and the fact that the management kept the applicant's identity papers placed significant restrictions on his personal liberty.

127. Moreover, it is not disputed that when the applicant did not return from leave of absence in 2006, the home's management asked the Ruse police to search for and return him (see paragraph 28 above). The Court can accept that such steps form part of the responsibilities assumed by the management of a home for people with mental disorders towards its residents. It further notes that the police did not escort the applicant back and that he has not proved that he was arrested pending the arrival of staff from the home. Nevertheless, since his authorised period of leave had expired, the staff returned him to the home without regard for his wishes.

128. Accordingly, although the applicant was able to undertake certain journeys, the factors outlined above lead the Court to consider that, contrary to what the Government maintained, he was under constant supervision and was not free to leave the home without permission whenever he wished. With reference to the *Dodov* case (cited above), the Government maintained that the restrictions in issue had been necessary in view of the authorities' positive obligations to protect the applicant's life and health. The Court notes that, in the above-mentioned case, the applicant's mother suffered from Alzheimer's disease and that, as a result, her memory and other mental capacities had progressively deteriorated, to the extent that the nursing home staff had been instructed not to leave her unattended. In the present case, however, the Government have not shown that the applicant's state of health was such as to put him at immediate risk, or to require the imposition of any special restrictions to protect his life and limb.

129. As regards the duration of the measure, the Court observes that it was not specified and was thus indefinite since the applicant was listed in the municipal registers as having his permanent address at the home, where he still remains (having lived there for more than eight years). This period is sufficiently lengthy for him to have felt the full adverse effects of the restrictions imposed on him.

130. As to the subjective aspect of the measure, it should be noted that, contrary to the requirements of domestic law (see paragraph 42 above), the applicant was not asked to give his opinion on his placement in the home and never explicitly consented to it. Instead, he was taken to Pastra by ambulance and placed in the home without being informed of the reasons

for or duration of that measure, which had been taken by his officially assigned guardian. The Court observes in this connection that there are situations where the wishes of a person with impaired mental faculties may validly be replaced by those of another person acting in the context of a protective measure and that it is sometimes difficult to ascertain the true wishes or preferences of the person concerned. However, the Court has already held that the fact that a person lacks legal capacity does not necessarily mean that he is unable to comprehend his situation (see *Shtukaturov*, cited above, § 108). In the present case, domestic law attached a certain weight to the applicant's wishes and it appears that he was well aware of his situation. The Court notes that, at least from 2004, the applicant explicitly expressed his desire to leave the Pastra social care home, both to psychiatrists and through his applications to the authorities to have his legal capacity restored and to be released from guardianship (see paragraphs 37-41 above).

131. These factors set the present case apart from *H.M. v. Switzerland* (cited above), in which the Court found that there had been no deprivation of liberty as the applicant had been placed in a nursing home purely in her own interests and, after her arrival there, had agreed to stay. In that connection the Government have not shown that in the present case, on arrival at the Pastra social care home or at any later date, the applicant agreed to stay there. That being so, the Court is not convinced that the applicant consented to the placement or accepted it tacitly at a later stage and throughout his stay.

132. Having regard to the particular circumstances of the present case, especially the involvement of the authorities in the decision to place the applicant in the home and its implementation, the rules on leave of absence, the duration of the placement and the applicant's lack of consent, the Court concludes that the situation under examination amounts to a deprivation of liberty within the meaning of Article 5 § 1 of the Convention. Accordingly, that provision is applicable.

C. Whether the applicant's placement in the Pastra social care home was compatible with Article 5 § 1

1. The parties' submissions

(a) The applicant

133. The applicant submitted that, since he had not consented to his placement in the Pastra social care home and had not signed the agreement drawn up between his guardian and the home, the agreement was in breach of the Persons and Family Act. He added that he had not been informed of the agreement's existence at the time of his placement and that he had remained unaware of it for a long time afterwards. Nor had he had any

opportunity to challenge this step taken by his guardian. Although the guardian had been required by Article 126 of the FC to report on her activities to the guardianship authority (the mayor), the latter was not empowered to take any action against her. Furthermore, no report had ever been drawn up in respect of the applicant, and his guardians had never been called to account for that shortcoming.

134. The applicant further argued that his placement in a home for people with mental disorders did not fall within any of the grounds on which deprivation of liberty could be justified for the purposes of Article 5. The measure in question had not been justified by the need to ensure public safety or by the inability of the person concerned to cope outside the institution. In support of that contention, the applicant argued that the Director of the home had deemed him capable of integrating into the community and that attempts had been made to bring him closer to his family, albeit to no avail. Accordingly, the authorities had based their decision to place him in the home on the simple fact that his family were not prepared to take care of him and he needed social assistance. They had not examined whether the necessary assistance could be provided through alternative measures that were less restrictive of his personal liberty. Such measures were, moreover, quite conceivable since Bulgarian legislation made provision for a wide range of social services, such as personal assistance, social rehabilitation centres and special allowances and pensions. The authorities had thus failed to strike a fair balance between the applicant's social needs and his right to liberty. It would be arbitrary, and contrary to the purpose of Article 5, for detention to be based on purely social considerations.

135. Should the Court take the view that the placement fell within the scope of Article 5 § 1 (e), by which persons of unsound mind could be deprived of their liberty, the applicant submitted that the national authorities had not satisfied the requirements of that provision. In the absence of a recent psychiatric assessment, it was clear that his placement in the home had not pursued the aim of providing him with medical treatment and had been based solely on medical documents produced in the context of the proceedings for his legal incapacitation. The documents had been issued approximately a year and a half beforehand and had not strictly concerned his placement in an institution for people with mental disorders. Relying on *Varbanov v. Bulgaria* (no. 31365/96, § 47, ECHR 2000-X), the applicant stated that he had been placed in the Pastra social care home without having undergone any assessment of his mental health at that time.

(b) The Government

136. The Government submitted that the applicant's placement in the home complied with domestic law as the guardian had signed an agreement whereby the applicant was to receive social services in his own interests.

She had therefore acted in accordance with her responsibilities and had discharged her duty to protect the person under partial guardianship.

137. Bearing in mind that the sole purpose of the placement had been to provide the applicant with social services under the Social Assistance Act and not to administer compulsory medical treatment, the Government submitted that this measure was not governed by Article 5 § 1 (e) of the Convention. In that connection, the authorities had taken into account his financial and family situation, that is to say, his lack of resources and the absence of close relatives able to assist him on a day-to-day basis.

138. The Government noted at the same time that the applicant could in any event be regarded as a “person of unsound mind” within the meaning of Article 5 § 1 (e). The medical assessment carried out during the proceedings for his legal incapacitation in 2000 showed clearly that he was suffering from mental disorders and that it was therefore legitimate for the authorities to place him in an institution for people with similar problems. Lastly, relying on the *Ashingdane* judgment (cited above, § 44), the Government submitted that there was an adequate link between the reason given for the placement, namely the applicant’s state of health, and the institution in which he had been placed. Accordingly, they contended that the measure in issue had not been in breach of Article 5 § 1 (e).

(c) The third party

139. On the basis of the study referred to in paragraphs 112 to 114 above, Interights submitted that in central and east European countries, the placement of mentally disordered persons in a social care home was viewed solely in terms of social protection and was governed by contractual law. Since such placements were not regarded as a form of deprivation of liberty under domestic law, the procedural safeguards available in relation to involuntary psychiatric confinement were not applicable.

140. Interights contended that situations of this nature were comparable to that examined in *H.L. v. the United Kingdom* (cited above), in which criticism had been levelled at the system prior to 2007 in the United Kingdom, whereby the common-law doctrine of necessity had permitted the “informal” detention of compliant incapacitated persons with mental disorders. The Court had held that the lack of any fixed procedural rules on the admission and detention of such persons was striking. In its view, the contrast between this dearth of regulation and the extensive network of safeguards applicable to formal psychiatric committals covered by mental-health legislation was significant. In the absence of a formalised admission procedure, indicating who could propose admission, for what reasons and on what basis, and given the lack of indication as to the length of the detention or the nature of treatment or care, the hospital’s health-care professionals had assumed full control of the liberty and treatment of a vulnerable incapacitated person solely on the basis of their own clinical

assessments completed as and when they saw fit. While not doubting that those professionals had acted in good faith and in the applicant's best interests, the Court had observed that the very purpose of procedural safeguards was to protect individuals against any misjudgments and professional lapses (*ibid.*, §§ 120-21).

141. Interights urged the Court to remain consistent with that approach and to find that in the present case the informal nature of admission to and continued detention in a social care home was at odds with the guarantees against arbitrariness under Article 5. The courts had not been involved at any stage of the proceedings and no other independent body had been assigned the task of monitoring the institutions in question. The lack of regulation coupled with the vulnerability of mentally disordered persons facilitated abuses of fundamental rights in a context of extremely limited supervision.

142. The third party further submitted that, in most cases of this kind, placements were automatic as there were few possibilities of alternative social assistance. It contended that the authorities should be under a practical obligation to provide for appropriate measures that were less restrictive of personal liberty but were nonetheless capable of ensuring medical care and social services for mentally disordered persons. This would be a means of applying the principle that the rights guaranteed by the Convention should not be theoretical or illusory but practical and effective.

2. *The Court's assessment*

(a) **General principles**

143. The Court reiterates that in order to comply with Article 5 § 1, the detention in issue must first of all be "lawful", including the observance of a procedure prescribed by law; in this respect the Convention refers back essentially to national law and lays down the obligation to conform to the substantive and procedural rules thereof. It requires in addition, however, that any deprivation of liberty should be consistent with the purpose of Article 5, namely to protect individuals from arbitrariness (see *Herczegfalvy v. Austria*, 24 September 1992, § 63, Series A no. 244). Furthermore, the detention of an individual is such a serious measure that it is only justified where other, less severe measures have been considered and found to be insufficient to safeguard the individual or public interest which might require that the person concerned be detained. That means that it does not suffice that the deprivation of liberty is in conformity with national law; it must also be necessary in the circumstances (see *Witold Litwa v. Poland*, no. 26629/95, § 78, ECHR 2000-III).

144. In addition, sub-paragraphs (a) to (f) of Article 5 § 1 contain an exhaustive list of permissible grounds of deprivation of liberty; such a measure will not be lawful unless it falls within one of those grounds (*ibid.*,

§ 49; see also, in particular, *Saadi v. the United Kingdom* [GC], no. 13229/03, § 43, ECHR 2008, and *Jendrowiak v. Germany*, no. 30060/04, § 31, 14 April 2011).

145. As regards the deprivation of liberty of mentally disordered persons, an individual cannot be deprived of his liberty as being of “unsound mind” unless the following three minimum conditions are satisfied: firstly, he must reliably be shown to be of unsound mind; secondly, the mental disorder must be of a kind or degree warranting compulsory confinement; thirdly, the validity of continued confinement depends upon the persistence of such a disorder (see *Winterwerp v. the Netherlands*, 24 October 1979, § 39, Series A no. 33; *Shtukaturov*, cited above, § 114; and *Varbanov*, cited above, § 45).

146. As to the second of the above conditions, the detention of a mentally disordered person may be necessary not only where the person needs therapy, medication or other clinical treatment to cure or alleviate his condition, but also where the person needs control and supervision to prevent him, for example, causing harm to himself or other persons (see *Hutchison Reid v. the United Kingdom*, no. 50272/99, § 52, ECHR 2003-IV).

147. The Court further reiterates that there must be some relationship between the ground of permitted deprivation of liberty relied on and the place and conditions of detention. In principle, the “detention” of a person as a mental-health patient will be “lawful” for the purposes of Article 5 § 1 (e) only if effected in a hospital, clinic or other appropriate institution authorised for that purpose (see *Ashingdane*, cited above, § 44, and *Pankiewicz v. Poland*, no. 34151/04, §§ 42-45, 12 February 2008). However, subject to the foregoing, Article 5 § 1 (e) is not in principle concerned with suitable treatment or conditions (see *Ashingdane*, cited above, § 44, and *Hutchison Reid*, cited above, § 49).

(b) Application of these principles in the present case

148. In examining whether the applicant’s placement in the Pastra social care home was lawful for the purposes of Article 5 § 1, the Court must ascertain whether the measure in question complied with domestic law, whether it fell within the scope of one of the exceptions provided for in sub-paragraphs (a) to (f) of Article 5 § 1 to the rule of personal liberty, and, lastly, whether it was justified on the basis of one of those exceptions.

149. On the basis of the relevant domestic instruments (see paragraphs 57-59 above), the Court notes that Bulgarian law envisages placement in a social care institution as a protective measure taken at the request of the person concerned and not a coercive one ordered on one of the grounds listed in sub-paragraphs (a) to (f) of Article 5 § 1. However, in the particular circumstances of the instant case, the measure in question entailed significant restrictions on personal freedom giving rise to a

deprivation of liberty with no regard for the applicant's will or wishes (see paragraphs 121-32 above).

150. As to whether a procedure prescribed by law was followed, the Court notes firstly that under domestic law the guardian of a person partially lacking legal capacity is not empowered to take legal steps on that person's behalf. Any contracts drawn up in such cases are valid only when signed together by the guardian and the person under partial guardianship (see paragraph 42 above). The Court therefore concludes that the decision by the applicant's guardian R.P. to place him in a social care home for people with mental disorders without having obtained his prior consent was invalid under Bulgarian law. This conclusion is in itself sufficient for the Court to establish that the applicant's deprivation of liberty was contrary to Article 5.

151. In any event, the Court considers that that measure was not lawful within the meaning of Article 5 § 1 of the Convention since it was not justified on the basis of any of sub-paragraphs (a) to (f).

152. The applicant accepted that the authorities had acted mainly on the basis of the arrangements governing social assistance (see paragraph 134 above). However, he argued that the restrictions imposed amounted to a deprivation of liberty which had not been warranted by any of the exceptions provided for in sub-paragraphs (a) to (f) of Article 5 § 1 to the rule of personal liberty. The Government contended that the applicant's placement in the home had been intended solely to protect his interest in receiving social care (see paragraphs 136-37 above). However, they stated that should the Court decide that Article 5 § 1 was applicable, the measure in question should be held to comply with sub-paragraph (e) in view of the applicant's mental disorder (see paragraph 138 above).

153. The Court notes that the applicant was eligible for social assistance as he had no accommodation and was unable to work as a result of his illness. It takes the view that, in certain circumstances, the welfare of a person with mental disorders might be a further factor to take into account, in addition to medical evidence, in assessing whether it is necessary to place the person in an institution. However, the objective need for accommodation and social assistance must not automatically lead to the imposition of measures involving deprivation of liberty. The Court considers that any protective measure should reflect as far as possible the wishes of persons capable of expressing their will. Failure to seek their opinion could give rise to situations of abuse and hamper the exercise of the rights of vulnerable persons. Therefore, any measure taken without prior consultation of the interested person will as a rule require careful scrutiny.

154. The Court is prepared to accept that the applicant's placement in the home was the direct consequence of the state of his mental health, the declaration of his partial incapacity and his placement under partial guardianship. Some six days after being appointed as the applicant's guardian, Ms R.P., without knowing him or meeting him, decided on the

strength of the file to ask social services to place him in a home for people with mental disorders. Social services, for their part, likewise referred to the applicant's mental health in finding that the request should be granted. It seems clear to the Court that if the applicant had not been deprived of legal capacity on account of his mental disorder, he would not have been deprived of his liberty. Therefore, the present case should be examined under sub-paragraph (e) of Article 5 § 1.

155. It remains to be determined whether the applicant's placement in the home satisfied the requirements laid down in the Court's case-law concerning the detention of mentally disordered persons (see the principles outlined in paragraph 145 above). In this connection, the Court reiterates that in deciding whether an individual should be detained as a "person of unsound mind", the national authorities are to be recognised as having a certain discretion since it is in the first place for them to evaluate the evidence adduced before them in a particular case; the Court's task is to review under the Convention the decisions of those authorities (see *Winterwerp*, cited above, § 40, and *Luberti v. Italy*, 23 February 1984, § 27, Series A no. 75).

156. In the instant case it is true that the expert medical report produced in the course of the proceedings for the applicant's legal incapacitation referred to the disorders from which he was suffering. However, the relevant examination took place before November 2000, whereas the applicant was placed in the Pastra social care home on 10 December 2002 (see paragraphs 10 and 14 above). More than two years thus elapsed between the expert psychiatric assessment relied on by the authorities and the applicant's placement in the home, during which time his guardian did not check whether there had been any change in his condition and did not meet or consult him. Unlike the Government (see paragraph 138 above), the Court considers that this period is excessive and that a medical opinion issued in 2000 cannot be regarded as a reliable reflection of the state of the applicant's mental health at the time of his placement. It should also be noted that the national authorities were not under any legal obligation to order a psychiatric report at the time of the placement. The Government explained in that connection that the applicable provisions were those of the Social Assistance Act and not those of the Health Act (see paragraphs 57-60 and 137 above). Nevertheless, in the Court's view, the lack of a recent medical assessment would be sufficient to conclude that the applicant's placement in the home was not lawful for the purposes of Article 5 § 1 (e).

157. As a subsidiary consideration, the Court observes that the other requirements of Article 5 § 1 (e) were not satisfied in the present case either. As regards the need to justify the placement by the severity of the disorder, it notes that the purpose of the 2000 medical report was not to examine whether the applicant's state of health required his placement in a home for people with mental disorders, but solely to determine the issue of his legal

protection. While it is true that Article 5 § 1 (e) authorises the confinement of a person suffering from a mental disorder even where no medical treatment is necessarily envisaged (see *Hutchison Reid*, cited above, § 52), such a measure must be properly justified by the seriousness of the person's condition in the interests of ensuring his or her own protection or that of others. In the present case, however, it has not been established that the applicant posed a danger to himself or to others, for example because of his psychiatric condition; the simple assertion by certain witnesses that he became aggressive when he drank (see paragraph 10 above) cannot suffice for this purpose. Nor have the authorities reported any acts of violence on the applicant's part during his time in the Pastra social care home.

158. The Court also notes deficiencies in the assessment of whether the disorders warranting the applicant's confinement still persisted. Although he was under the supervision of a psychiatrist (see paragraph 31 above), the aim of such supervision was not to provide an assessment at regular intervals of whether he still needed to be kept in the Pastra social care home for the purposes of Article 5 § 1 (e). Indeed, no provision was made for such an assessment under the relevant legislation.

159. Having regard to the foregoing, the Court observes that the applicant's placement in the home was not ordered "in accordance with a procedure prescribed by law" and that his deprivation of liberty was not justified by sub-paragraph (e) of Article 5 § 1. Furthermore, the Government have not indicated any of the other grounds listed in sub-paragraphs (a) to (f) which might have justified the deprivation of liberty in issue in the present case.

160. There has therefore been a violation of Article 5 § 1 of the Convention.

II. ALLEGED VIOLATION OF ARTICLE 5 § 4 OF THE CONVENTION

161. The applicant complained that he had been unable to have the lawfulness of his placement in the Pastra social care home reviewed by a court.

He relied on Article 5 § 4 of the Convention, which provides:

"Everyone who is deprived of his liberty by arrest or detention shall be entitled to take proceedings by which the lawfulness of his detention shall be decided speedily by a court and his release ordered if the detention is not lawful."

A. The parties' submissions

1. The applicant

162. The applicant submitted that domestic law did not provide for any specific remedies in respect of his situation, such as a periodic judicial

review of the lawfulness of his placement in a home for people with mental disorders. He added that, since he was deemed incapable of taking legal action on his own, domestic law did not afford him the possibility of applying to a court for permission to leave the Pastra social care home. He stated that he had likewise been unable to seek to have the placement agreement terminated, in view of the conflict of interests with his guardian, who at the same time was the Director of the home.

163. The applicant further noted that he had not been allowed to apply to the courts to initiate the procedure provided for in Article 277 of the CCP (see paragraph 51 above) and that, moreover, such action would not have led to a review of the lawfulness of his deprivation of liberty but solely to a review of the conditions justifying partial guardianship in his case.

164. He further submitted that the procedure provided for in Articles 113 and 115 of the FC (see paragraphs 49-50 above) in theory afforded his close relatives the right to ask the mayor to replace the guardian or to compel the mayor to terminate the placement agreement. However, this had been an indirect remedy not accessible to him, since his half-sister and his father's second wife had not been willing to initiate such a procedure.

2. *The Government*

165. The Government submitted that, since the purpose of the applicant's placement in the home had been to provide social services, he could at any time have asked for the placement agreement to be terminated without the courts needing to be involved. In their submission, in so far as the applicant alleged a conflict of interests with his guardian, he could have relied on Article 123 § 1 of the FC (see paragraph 50 above) and requested the guardianship authority to appoint an *ad hoc* representative, who could then have consented to a change of permanent residence.

166. The Government further contended that the applicant's close relatives had not availed themselves of the possibility open to some of them under Articles 113 and 115 of the FC of requesting the guardianship authority to replace his guardian or of challenging steps taken by the latter. They added that in the event of a refusal, his relatives could have appealed to a court, which would have considered the merits of the case and, if appropriate, appointed a new guardian, who could then have terminated the placement agreement. This, in the Government's submission, would have enabled them to challenge in substance the agreement signed between Ms R.P. and the Pastra social care home.

167. Lastly, the Government submitted that an action for restoration of legal capacity (under Article 277 of the CCP – see paragraph 51 above) constituted a remedy for the purposes of Article 5 § 4 since, if a sufficient improvement in the applicant's health had been observed and he had been released from guardianship, he would have been free to leave the home.

B. The Court's assessment

1. General principles

168. The Court reiterates that Article 5 § 4 entitles detained persons to institute proceedings for a review of compliance with the procedural and substantive conditions which are essential for the “lawfulness”, in Convention terms, of their deprivation of liberty. The notion of “lawfulness” under paragraph 4 of Article 5 has the same meaning as in paragraph 1, so that a detained person is entitled to a review of the “lawfulness” of his detention in the light not only of the requirements of domestic law but also of the Convention, the general principles embodied therein and the aim of the restrictions permitted by Article 5 § 1. Article 5 § 4 does not guarantee a right to judicial review of such a scope as to empower the court, on all aspects of the case including questions of pure expediency, to substitute its own discretion for that of the decision-making authority. The review should, however, be wide enough to bear on those conditions which are essential for the “lawful” detention of a person according to Article 5 § 1 (see *E. v. Norway*, 29 August 1990, § 50, Series A no. 181-A). The reviewing “court” must not have merely advisory functions but must have the competence to “decide” the “lawfulness” of the detention and to order release if the detention is unlawful (see *Ireland v. the United Kingdom*, 18 January 1978, § 200, Series A no. 25; *Weeks v. the United Kingdom*, 2 March 1987, § 61, Series A no. 114; *Chahal v. the United Kingdom*, 15 November 1996, § 130, *Reports of Judgments and Decisions* 1996-V; and *A. and Others v. the United Kingdom* [GC], no. 3455/05, § 202, ECHR 2009).

169. The forms of judicial review satisfying the requirements of Article 5 § 4 may vary from one domain to another, and will depend on the type of deprivation of liberty in issue. It is not the Court's task to inquire into what would be the most appropriate system in the sphere under examination (see *Shtukaturov*, cited above, § 123).

170. Nevertheless, Article 5 § 4 guarantees a remedy that must be accessible to the person concerned and must afford the possibility of reviewing compliance with the conditions to be satisfied if the detention of a person of unsound mind is to be regarded as “lawful” for the purposes of Article 5 § 1 (e) (see *Ashingdane*, cited above, § 52). The Convention requirement for an act of deprivation of liberty to be amenable to independent judicial scrutiny is of fundamental importance in the context of the underlying purpose of Article 5 of the Convention to provide safeguards against arbitrariness. What is at stake is both the protection of the physical liberty of individuals and their personal security (see *Varbanov*, cited above, § 58). In the case of detention on the ground of mental illness, special procedural safeguards may be called for in order to protect the interests of persons who, on account of their mental disabilities, are not fully capable of

acting for themselves (see, among other authorities, *Winterwerp*, cited above, § 60).

171. Among the principles emerging from the Court's case-law under Article 5 § 4 concerning "persons of unsound mind" are the following:

(a) a person detained for an indefinite or lengthy period is in principle entitled, at any rate where there is no automatic periodic review of a judicial character, to take proceedings "at reasonable intervals" before a court to put in issue the "lawfulness" – within the meaning of the Convention – of his detention;

(b) Article 5 § 4 requires the procedure followed to have a judicial character and to afford the individual concerned guarantees appropriate to the kind of deprivation of liberty in question; in order to determine whether proceedings provide adequate guarantees, regard must be had to the particular nature of the circumstances in which they take place;

(c) the judicial proceedings referred to in Article 5 § 4 need not always be attended by the same guarantees as those required under Article 6 § 1 for civil or criminal litigation. Nonetheless, it is essential that the person concerned should have access to a court and the opportunity to be heard either in person or, where necessary, through some form of representation (see *Megyeri v. Germany*, 12 May 1992, § 22, Series A no. 237-A).

2. Application of these principles in the present case

172. The Court observes that the Government have not indicated any domestic remedy capable of affording the applicant the direct opportunity to challenge the lawfulness of his placement in the Pastra social care home and the continued implementation of that measure. It also notes that the Bulgarian courts were not involved at any time or in any way in the placement and that the domestic legislation does not provide for automatic periodic judicial review of placement in a home for people with mental disorders. Furthermore, since the applicant's placement in the home is not recognised as a deprivation of liberty in Bulgarian law (see paragraph 58 above), there is no provision for any domestic legal remedies by which to challenge its lawfulness in terms of a deprivation of liberty. In addition, the Court notes that, according to the domestic courts' practice, the validity of the placement agreement could have been challenged on the ground of lack of consent only on the guardian's initiative (see paragraph 54 above).

173. In so far as the Government referred to the procedure for restoration of legal capacity under Article 277 of the CCP (see paragraph 167 above), the Court notes that the purpose of this procedure would not have been to examine the lawfulness of the applicant's placement *per se*, but solely to review his legal status (see paragraphs 233-46 below). The Government also referred to the procedures for reviewing steps taken by the guardian (see paragraphs 165-66 above). The Court considers it necessary to determine whether such remedies could have given rise to a

judicial review of the lawfulness of the placement as required by Article 5 § 4.

174. In this connection, it notes that the 1985 FC entitled close relatives of a person under partial guardianship to challenge decisions by the guardianship authority, which in turn was required to review steps taken by the guardian – including the placement agreement – and to replace the latter in the event of failure to discharge his or her duties (see paragraphs 48-50 above). However, the Court notes that those remedies were not directly accessible to the applicant. Moreover, none of the persons theoretically entitled to make use of them displayed any intention of acting in Mr Stanev's interests, and he himself was unable to act on his own initiative without their approval.

175. It is uncertain whether the applicant could have requested the mayor to demand explanations from the guardian or to suspend the implementation of the placement agreement on the ground that it was invalid. In any event, it appears that since he had been partially deprived of legal capacity, the law did not entitle him to apply of his own motion to the courts to challenge steps taken by the mayor (see paragraph 49 above); this was not disputed by the Government.

176. The same conclusion applies as regards the possibility for the applicant to ask the mayor to replace his guardian temporarily with an *ad hoc* representative on the basis of an alleged conflict of interests and then to apply for the termination of the placement agreement. The Court observes in this connection that the mayor has discretion to determine whether there is a conflict of interests (see paragraph 50 above). Lastly, it does not appear that the applicant could have applied of his own motion to the courts for a review on the merits in the event of the mayor's refusal to take such action.

177. The Court therefore concludes that the remedies referred to by the Government were either inaccessible to the applicant or were not judicial in nature. Furthermore, none of them can give rise to a direct review of the lawfulness of the applicant's placement in the Pastra social care home in terms of domestic law and the Convention.

178. Having regard to those considerations, the Court dismisses the Government's objection of failure to exhaust domestic remedies (see paragraphs 97-99 above) and finds that there has been a violation of Article 5 § 4 of the Convention.

III. ALLEGED VIOLATION OF ARTICLE 5 § 5 OF THE CONVENTION

179. The applicant submitted that he had not been entitled to compensation for the alleged violations of his rights under Article 5 §§ 1 and 4 of the Convention.

He relied on Article 5 § 5, which provides:

“Everyone who has been the victim of arrest or detention in contravention of the provisions of this Article shall have an enforceable right to compensation.”

A. The parties’ submissions

180. The applicant submitted that the circumstances in which unlawful detention could give rise to compensation were exhaustively listed in the State Responsibility for Damage Act 1988 (see paragraphs 62-67 above) and that his own situation was not covered by any of them. He further complained that there were no legal remedies by which compensation could be claimed for a violation of Article 5 § 4.

181. The Government maintained that the compensation procedure under the 1988 Act could have been initiated if the applicant’s placement in the home had been found to have no legal basis. Since the placement had been found to be consistent with domestic law and with his own interests, he had not been able to initiate the procedure in question.

B. The Court’s assessment

182. The Court reiterates that Article 5 § 5 is complied with where it is possible to apply for compensation in respect of a deprivation of liberty effected in conditions contrary to paragraphs 1, 2, 3 or 4 (see *Wassink v. the Netherlands*, 27 September 1990, § 38, Series A no. 185-A, and *Houtman and Meeus v. Belgium*, no. 22945/07, § 43, 17 March 2009). The right to compensation set forth in paragraph 5 therefore presupposes that a violation of one of the other paragraphs has been established, either by a domestic authority or by the Convention institutions. In this connection, the effective enjoyment of the right to compensation guaranteed by Article 5 § 5 must be ensured with a sufficient degree of certainty (see *Ciulla v. Italy*, 22 February 1989, § 44, Series A no. 148; *Sakık and Others v. Turkey*, 26 November 1997, § 60, *Reports* 1997-VII; and *N.C. v. Italy* [GC], no. 24952/94, § 49, ECHR 2002-X).

183. Turning to the present case, the Court observes that, regard being had to its finding of a violation of paragraphs 1 and 4 of Article 5, paragraph 5 is applicable. It must therefore ascertain whether, prior to the present judgment, the applicant had an enforceable right at domestic level to compensation for damage, or whether he will have such a right following the adoption of this judgment.

184. The Court reiterates in this connection that in order to find a violation of Article 5 § 5, it has to establish that the finding of a violation of one of the other paragraphs of Article 5 could not give rise, either before or after the Court’s judgment, to an enforceable claim for compensation before the domestic courts (see *Brogan and Others v. the United Kingdom*, 29 November 1988, §§ 66-67, Series A no. 145-B).

185. Having regard to the case-law cited above, the Court considers that it must first be determined whether the violation of Article 5 §§ 1 and 4 found in the present case could have given rise, before the delivery of this judgment, to an entitlement to compensation before the domestic courts.

186. As regards the violation of Article 5 § 1, the Court observes that section 2(1) of the State Responsibility for Damage Act 1988 provides for compensation for damage resulting from a judicial decision ordering certain types of detention where the decision has been set aside as having no legal basis (see paragraph 62 above). However, that was not the case in this instance. It appears from the case file that the Bulgarian judicial authorities have not at any stage found the measure to have been unlawful or otherwise in breach of Article 5 of the Convention. Moreover, the Government's line of argument has been that the applicant's placement in the home was in accordance with domestic law. The Court therefore concludes that the applicant was unable to claim any compensation under the above-mentioned provision in the absence of an acknowledgment by the national authorities that the placement was unlawful.

187. As to the possibility under section 1 of the same Act of claiming compensation for damage resulting from unlawful acts by the authorities (see paragraph 63 above), the Court observes that the Government have not produced any domestic decisions indicating that that provision is applicable to cases involving the placement of people with mental disorders in social care homes on the basis of civil-law agreements.

188. Furthermore, since no judicial remedy by which to review the lawfulness of the placement was available under Bulgarian law, the applicant could not have invoked State liability as a basis for receiving compensation for the violation of Article 5 § 4.

189. The question then arises whether the judgment in the present case, in which violations of paragraphs 1 and 4 of Article 5 have been found, will entitle the applicant to claim compensation under Bulgarian law. The Court observes that it does not appear from the relevant legislation that any such remedy exists; nor, indeed, have the Government submitted any arguments to prove the contrary.

190. It has therefore not been shown the applicant was able to avail himself prior to the Court's judgment in the present case, or will be able to do so after its delivery, of a right to compensation for the violation of Article 5 §§ 1 and 4.

191. There has therefore been a violation of Article 5 § 5.

IV. ALLEGED VIOLATIONS OF ARTICLE 3 OF THE CONVENTION TAKEN ALONE AND IN CONJUNCTION WITH ARTICLE 13

192. The applicant complained that the living conditions in the Pastra social care home were poor and that no effective remedy was available

under Bulgarian law in respect of that complaint. He relied on Article 3 of the Convention taken alone and in conjunction with Article 13. These provisions are worded as follows:

Article 3

“No one shall be subjected to torture or to inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment.”

Article 13

“Everyone whose rights and freedoms as set forth in [the] 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.”

A. Preliminary objection of failure to exhaust domestic remedies

193. In their memorial before the Grand Chamber, the Government for the first time raised an objection of failure to exhaust domestic remedies in respect of the complaint under Article 3 of the Convention. They submitted that the applicant could have obtained compensation for the living conditions in the home by bringing an action under the State Responsibility for Damage Act 1988.

194. The Court reiterates that, in accordance with Rule 55 of the Rules of Court, any plea of inadmissibility must, in so far as its character and the circumstances permit, be raised by the respondent Contracting Party in its written or oral observations on the admissibility of the application (see *N.C. v. Italy*, cited above, § 44). Where an objection of failure to exhaust domestic remedies is raised out of time for the purposes of Rule 55, an estoppel arises and the objection must accordingly be dismissed (see *Velikova v. Bulgaria*, no. 41488/98, § 57, ECHR 2000-VI, and *Tanribilir v. Turkey*, no. 21422/93, § 59, 16 November 2000).

195. In the present case the Government have not cited any circumstances justifying their failure to raise the objection in question at the time of the Chamber’s examination of the admissibility of the case.

196. That being so, the Court observes that the Government are estopped from raising this objection, which must accordingly be dismissed.

B. Merits of the complaint under Article 3 of the Convention

1. The parties’ submissions

197. The applicant submitted that the poor living conditions in the Pastra social care home, in particular the inadequate food, the deplorable sanitary conditions, the lack of heating, the enforced medical treatment, the overcrowded bedrooms and the absence of therapeutic and cultural activities, amounted to treatment prohibited by Article 3.

198. He observed that the Government had already acknowledged in 2004 that such living conditions did not comply with the relevant European standards and had undertaken to make improvements (see paragraph 82 above). However, the conditions had remained unchanged, at least until late 2009.

199. In their observations before the Chamber, the Government acknowledged the deficiencies in the living conditions at the home. They explained that the inadequate financial resources set aside for institutions of this kind formed the main obstacle to ensuring the requisite minimum standard of living. They also stated that, following an inspection by the Social Assistance Agency, the authorities had resolved to close the Pastra social care home and to take steps to improve living conditions for its residents. In the Government's submission, since the living conditions were the same for all the home's residents and there had been no intention to inflict ill-treatment, the applicant had not been subjected to degrading treatment.

200. Before the Grand Chamber the Government stated that renovation work had been carried out in late 2009 in the part of the home where the applicant lived (see paragraph 24 above).

2. *The Court's assessment*

(a) **General principles**

201. Article 3 enshrines one of the most fundamental values of democratic society. It prohibits in absolute terms torture or inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment, irrespective of the circumstances and the victim's behaviour (see, among other authorities, *Kudła v. Poland* [GC], no. 30210/96, § 90, ECHR 2000-XI, and *Poltoratskiy v. Ukraine*, no. 38812/97, § 130, ECHR 2003-V).

202. Ill-treatment must attain a minimum level of severity if it is to fall within the scope of Article 3. The assessment of this minimum is, in the nature of things, relative; it depends on all the circumstances of the case, such as the nature and context of the treatment, the manner and method of its execution, its duration, its physical or mental effects and, in some instances, the sex, age and state of health of the victim (see *Kudła*, cited above, § 91, and *Poltoratskiy*, cited above, § 131).

203. Treatment has been held by the Court to be "inhuman" because, *inter alia*, it was premeditated, was applied for hours at a stretch and caused either actual bodily injury or intense physical or mental suffering (see *Labita v. Italy* [GC], no. 26772/95, § 120, ECHR 2000-IV). Treatment has been considered "degrading" when it was such as to arouse in its victims feelings of fear, anguish and inferiority capable of humiliating and debasing them and possibly breaking their physical or moral resistance or driving them to act against their will or conscience (see *Jalloh v. Germany* [GC],

no. 54810/00, § 68, ECHR 2006-IX). In this connection, the question whether such treatment was intended to humiliate or debase the victim is a factor to be taken into account, although the absence of any such purpose does not inevitably lead to a finding that there has been no violation of Article 3 (see *Peers v. Greece*, no. 28524/95, §§ 67, 68 and 74, ECHR 2001-III, and *Kalashnikov v. Russia*, no. 47095/99, § 95, ECHR 2002-VI).

204. The suffering and humiliation involved must in any event go beyond that inevitable element of suffering or humiliation connected with a given form of legitimate treatment or punishment. Measures depriving a person of his liberty may often involve such an element. Yet it cannot be said that deprivation of liberty in itself raises an issue under Article 3 of the Convention. Nevertheless, under that Article the State must ensure that a person is detained in conditions which are compatible with respect for his human dignity, that the manner and method of the execution of the measure do not subject him to distress or hardship of an intensity exceeding the unavoidable level of suffering inherent in detention and that, given the practical demands of imprisonment, his health and well-being are adequately secured by, among other things, providing him with the requisite medical assistance (see *Kudla*, cited above, §§ 92-94).

205. When assessing the conditions of a deprivation of liberty under Article 3 of the Convention, account has to be taken of their cumulative effects and the duration of the measure in question (see *Kalashnikov*, cited above, §§ 95 and 102; *Kehayov v. Bulgaria*, no. 41035/98, § 64, 18 January 2005; and *Iovchev v. Bulgaria*, no. 41211/98, § 127, 2 February 2006). In this connection an important factor to take into account, besides the material conditions, is the detention regime. In assessing whether a restrictive regime may amount to treatment contrary to Article 3 in a given case, regard must be had to the particular conditions, the stringency of the regime, its duration, the objective pursued and its effects on the person concerned (see *Kehayov*, cited above, § 65).

(b) Application of these principles in the present case

206. In the present case the Court has found that the applicant's placement in the Pastra social care home – a situation for which the domestic authorities must be held responsible – amounts to a deprivation of liberty within the meaning of Article 5 of the Convention (see paragraph 132 above). It follows that Article 3 is applicable to the applicant's situation, seeing that it prohibits the inhuman and degrading treatment of anyone in the care of the authorities. The Court would emphasise that the prohibition of ill-treatment in Article 3 applies equally to all forms of deprivation of liberty, and in particular makes no distinction according to the purpose of the measure in issue; it is immaterial whether the measure entails detention ordered in the context of criminal proceedings

or admission to an institution with the aim of protecting the life or health of the person concerned.

207. The Court notes at the outset that, according to the Government, the building in which the applicant lives was renovated in late 2009, resulting in an improvement in his living conditions (see paragraph 200 above); the applicant did not dispute this. The Court therefore considers that the applicant's complaint should be taken to refer to the period between 2002 and 2009. The Government have not denied that during that period the applicant's living conditions corresponded to his description, and have also acknowledged that, for economic reasons, there were certain deficiencies in that regard (see paragraphs 198-99 above).

208. The Court observes that although the applicant shared a room measuring 16 sq. m with four other residents, he enjoyed considerable freedom of movement both inside and outside the home, a fact likely to lessen the adverse effects of a limited sleeping area (see *Valašinas v. Lithuania*, no. 44558/98, § 103, ECHR 2001-VIII).

209. Nevertheless, other aspects of the applicant's physical living conditions are a considerable cause for concern. In particular, it appears that the food was insufficient and of poor quality. The building was inadequately heated and in winter the applicant had to sleep in his coat. He was able to have a shower once a week in an unhygienic and dilapidated bathroom. The toilets were in an execrable state and access to them was dangerous, according to the findings by the CPT (see paragraphs 21, 22, 23, 78 and 79 above). In addition, the home did not return clothes to the same people after they were washed (see paragraph 21 above), which was likely to arouse a feeling of inferiority in the residents.

210. The Court cannot overlook the fact that the applicant was exposed to all the above-mentioned conditions for a considerable period of approximately seven years. Nor can it ignore the findings of the CPT, which, after visiting the home, concluded that the living conditions there at the relevant time could be said to amount to inhuman and degrading treatment. Despite being aware of those findings, during the period from 2002 to 2009 the Government did not act on their undertaking to close down the institution (see paragraph 82 above). The Court considers that the lack of financial resources cited by the Government is not a relevant argument to justify keeping the applicant in the living conditions described (see *Poltoratskiy*, cited above, § 148).

211. It would nevertheless emphasise that there is no suggestion that the national authorities deliberately intended to inflict degrading treatment. However, as noted above (see paragraph 203), the absence of any such purpose cannot conclusively rule out a finding of a violation of Article 3.

212. In conclusion, while noting the improvements apparently made to the Pastra social care home since late 2009, the Court considers that, taken

as a whole, the living conditions to which the applicant was exposed during a period of approximately seven years amounted to degrading treatment.

213. There has therefore been a violation of Article 3 of the Convention.

C. Merits of the complaint under Article 13 taken in conjunction with Article 3

1. The parties' submissions

214. The applicant submitted that no domestic remedies, including the claim for compensation envisaged in the State Responsibility for Damage Act 1988, had been accessible to him without his guardian's consent. He pointed out in that connection that he had not had a guardian for a period of more than two years, between the end of Ms R.P.'s designated term on 31 December 2002 (see paragraph 12 above) and the appointment of a new guardian on 2 February 2005 (see paragraph 17 above). Moreover, his new guardian was also the Director of the social care home. There would therefore have been a conflict of interests between the applicant and his guardian in the event of any dispute concerning the living conditions at the home, and the applicant could not have expected the guardian to support his allegations.

215. In the Government's submission, an action for restoration of legal capacity (see paragraphs 51-52 above) constituted a remedy by which the applicant could have secured a review of his status and, in the event of being released from partial guardianship, he could have left the social care home and ceased to endure the living conditions about which he complained.

216. The Government added that the applicant could have complained directly about the living conditions at the Pastra social care home by bringing an action under section 1 of the State Responsibility for Damage Act 1988 (see paragraphs 62-67 above).

2. The Court's assessment

217. The Court refers to its settled case-law to the effect that Article 13 guarantees the existence of a domestic remedy to deal with the substance of an "arguable complaint" under the Convention and to grant appropriate relief. Contracting States are afforded some discretion as to the manner in which they conform to their obligations under this provision. The scope of the obligation under Article 13 varies depending on the nature of the applicant's complaint under the Convention. Nevertheless, the remedy required by Article 13 must be "effective" in practice as well as in law (see *McGlinchey and Others v. the United Kingdom*, no. 50390/99, § 62, ECHR 2003-V).

218. Where, as in the present case, the Court has found a breach of Article 3, compensation for the non-pecuniary damage flowing from the breach should in principle be part of the range of available remedies (*ibid.*, § 63; and *Iovchev*, cited above, § 143).

219. In the instant case the Court observes that section 1(1) of the State Responsibility for Damage Act 1988 has indeed been interpreted by the domestic courts as being applicable to damage suffered by prisoners as a result of poor detention conditions (see paragraphs 63-64 above). However, according to the Government's submissions, the applicant's placement in the Pastra social care home is not regarded as detention under domestic law (see paragraphs 108-11 above). Therefore, he would not have been entitled to compensation for the poor living conditions in the home. Moreover, there are no judicial precedents in which this provision has been found to apply to allegations of poor conditions in social care homes (see paragraph 65 above), and the Government have not adduced any arguments to prove the contrary. Having regard to those considerations, the Court concludes that the remedies in question were not effective within the meaning of Article 13.

220. As to the Government's reference to the procedure for restoration of legal capacity (see paragraph 215 above), the Court considers that, even assuming that as a result of that remedy the applicant had been able to have his legal capacity restored and to leave the home, he would not have been awarded any compensation for his treatment during his placement there. Accordingly, the remedy in question did not afford appropriate redress.

221. There has therefore been a violation of Article 13 of the Convention taken in conjunction with Article 3.

V. ALLEGED VIOLATION OF ARTICLE 6 § 1 OF THE CONVENTION

222. The applicant alleged that Bulgarian law had not afforded him the possibility of applying to a court for restoration of his legal capacity. He relied on Article 6 § 1 of the Convention, the relevant parts of which read:

“In the determination of his civil rights and obligations ... everyone is entitled to a fair ... hearing ... by [a] ... tribunal ...”

A. Preliminary remarks

223. The Grand Chamber observes that the Government have maintained before it the objection they raised before the Chamber alleging failure to exhaust domestic remedies. The objection was based on Article 277 of the CCP, which, according to the Government, entitled the applicant to apply personally to the courts for restoration of his legal capacity.

224. The Grand Chamber notes that in its admissibility decision of 29 June 2010 the Chamber observed that the applicant disputed the accessibility of the remedy which, according to the Government, would have enabled him to obtain a review of his legal status and that that argument underpinned his complaint under Article 6 § 1. The Chamber thus joined the Government's objection to its examination of the merits of the complaint in question. The Grand Chamber sees no reason to depart from the Chamber's conclusion.

B. Merits

1. The parties' submissions

225. The applicant maintained that he had been unable personally to institute proceedings for restoration of his legal capacity under Article 277 of the CCP and that this was borne out by the Supreme Court's decision no. 5/79 (see paragraph 51 above). In support of that argument, he submitted that the Dupnitsa District Court had declined to examine his application for judicial review of the mayor's refusal to bring such proceedings, on the ground that the guardian had not countersigned the form of authority (see paragraphs 39-40 above).

226. In addition, although an action for restoration of legal capacity had not been accessible to him, the applicant had attempted to bring such an action through the public prosecutor's office, the mayor and his guardian (the Director of the home). However, since no application to that end had been lodged with the courts, all his attempts had failed. Accordingly, the applicant had never had the opportunity to have his case heard by a court.

227. The Government submitted that Article 277 of the CCP had offered the applicant direct access to a court at any time to have his legal status reviewed. They pointed out that, contrary to what the applicant alleged, the Supreme Court's decision no. 5/79 had interpreted Article 277 of the CCP as meaning that persons partially deprived of legal capacity could apply directly to the courts to be released from guardianship. The only condition for making such an application was the production of evidence of an improvement in their condition. However, as was indicated by the medical assessment carried out at the public prosecutor's request (see paragraph 37 above), which had concluded that the applicant's condition still persisted and that he was incapable of looking after his own interests, it was clear that the applicant had not had any such evidence available. The Government thus concluded that the applicant had not attempted to apply to the court on his own because he had been unable to substantiate his application.

228. The Government further observed that the courts regularly considered applications for restoration of legal capacity submitted, for example, by a guardian (see paragraph 52 above).

2. *The Court's assessment*

(a) **General principles**

229. The Court reiterates that Article 6 § 1 secures to everyone the right to have any claim relating to his or her civil rights and obligations brought before a court or tribunal (see *Golder v. the United Kingdom*, 21 February 1975, § 36, Series A no. 18). This “right to a court”, of which the right of access is an aspect, may be relied on by anyone who considers on arguable grounds that an interference with the exercise of his or her civil rights is unlawful and complains that no possibility was afforded to submit that claim to a court meeting the requirements of Article 6 § 1 (see, *inter alia*, *Roche v. the United Kingdom* [GC], no. 32555/96, § 117, ECHR 2005-X, and *Salontaji-Drobnjak v. Serbia*, no. 36500/05, § 132, 13 October 2009).

230. The right of access to the courts is not absolute but may be subject to limitations; these are permitted by implication since the right of access “by its very nature calls for regulation by the State, regulation which may vary in time and in place according to the needs and resources of the community and of individuals” (see *Ashingdane*, cited above, § 57). In laying down such regulation, the Contracting States enjoy a certain margin of appreciation. Whilst the final decision as to observance of the Convention’s requirements rests with the Court, it is no part of the Court’s function to substitute for the assessment of the national authorities any other assessment of what might be the best policy in this field. Nonetheless, the limitations applied must not restrict the access left to the individual in such a way or to such an extent that the very essence of the right is impaired. Furthermore, a limitation will not be compatible with Article 6 § 1 if it does not pursue a legitimate aim and if there is not a reasonable relationship of proportionality between the means employed and the aim sought to be achieved (*ibid.*; see also, among many other authorities, *Cordova v. Italy*, no. 40877/98, § 54, ECHR 2003-I, and the recapitulation of the relevant principles in *Fayed v. the United Kingdom*, 21 September 1994, § 65, Series A no. 294-B).

231. Furthermore, the Convention is intended to guarantee not rights that are theoretical or illusory but rights that are practical and effective. This is particularly true for the guarantees enshrined in Article 6, in view of the prominent place held in a democratic society by the right to a fair trial with all the guarantees under that Article (see *Prince Hans-Adam II of Liechtenstein v. Germany* [GC], no. 42527/98, § 45, ECHR 2001-VIII).

232. Lastly, the Court observes that in most of the cases before it involving “persons of unsound mind”, the domestic proceedings have concerned their detention and were thus examined under Article 5 of the Convention. However, it has consistently held that the “procedural” guarantees under Article 5 §§ 1 and 4 of the Convention are broadly similar to those under Article 6 § 1 (see, for instance, *Winterwerp*, cited above,

§ 60; *Sanchez-Reisse v. Switzerland*, 21 October 1986, §§ 51 and 55, Series A no. 107; *Kampanis v. Greece*, 13 July 1995, § 47, Series A no. 318-B; and *Ilijkov v. Bulgaria*, no. 33977/96, § 103, 26 July 2001). In the *Shtukaturrov* case (cited above, § 66), in determining whether or not the incapacitation proceedings had been fair, the Court had regard, *mutatis mutandis*, to its case-law under Article 5 §§ 1 (e) and 4 of the Convention.

(b) Application of these principles in the present case

233. The Court observes at the outset that in the present case none of the parties disputed the applicability of Article 6 to proceedings for restoration of legal capacity. The applicant, who has been partially deprived of legal capacity, complained that Bulgarian law did not afford him direct access to a court to apply to have his capacity restored. The Court has had occasion to clarify that proceedings for restoration of legal capacity are directly decisive for the determination of “civil rights and obligations” (see *Matter v. Slovakia*, no. 31534/96, § 51, 5 July 1999). Article 6 § 1 of the Convention is therefore applicable in the instant case.

234. It remains to be determined whether the applicant’s access to court was restricted and, if so, whether the restriction pursued a legitimate aim and was proportionate to it.

235. The Court notes firstly that the parties differed as to whether a legally incapacitated person had *locus standi* to apply directly to the Bulgarian courts for restoration of legal capacity; the Government argued that this was the case, whereas the applicant maintained the contrary.

236. The Court accepts the applicant’s argument that, in order to make an application to a Bulgarian court, a person under partial guardianship is required to seek the support of the persons referred to in Article 277 of the 1952 CCP (which has become Article 340 of the 2007 CCP). The list of persons entitled to apply to the courts under Bulgarian law does not explicitly include a person under partial guardianship (see paragraphs 45 and 51 above).

237. With regard to the Supreme Court’s 1980 decision (see paragraph 51 above), the Court observes that, although the fourth sentence of paragraph 10 of the decision, read in isolation, might give the impression that a person under partial guardianship has direct access to a court, the Supreme Court explains further on that, where the guardian of a partially incapacitated person and the guardianship authority refuse to institute proceedings for restoration of legal capacity, the person concerned may request the public prosecutor to do so. In the Court’s view, the need to seek the intervention of the public prosecutor is scarcely reconcilable with direct access to court for persons under partial guardianship in so far as the decision to intervene is left to the prosecutor’s discretion. It follows that the Supreme Court’s 1980 decision cannot be said to have clearly affirmed the existence of such access in Bulgarian law.

238. The Court further notes that the Government have not produced any court decisions showing that persons under partial guardianship have been able to apply of their own motion to a court to have the measure lifted; however, they have shown that at least one application for restoration of legal capacity has been successfully brought by the guardian of a fully incapacitated person (see paragraph 52 above).

239. The Court thus considers it established that the applicant was unable to apply for restoration of his legal capacity other than through his guardian or one of the persons listed in Article 277 of the CCP.

240. The Court would also emphasise that, as far as access to court is concerned, domestic law makes no distinction between those who are entirely deprived of legal capacity and those who, like the applicant, are only partially incapacitated. Moreover, domestic legislation does not provide for any possibility of automatic periodic review of whether the grounds for placing a person under guardianship remain valid. Lastly, in the applicant's case the measure in question was not limited in time.

241. Admittedly, the right of access to the courts is not absolute and requires by its very nature that the State should enjoy a certain margin of appreciation in regulating the sphere under examination (see *Ashingdane*, cited above, § 57). In addition, the Court acknowledges that restrictions on a person's procedural rights, even where the person has been only partially deprived of legal capacity, may be justified for the person's own protection, the protection of the interests of others and the proper administration of justice. However, the importance of exercising these rights will vary according to the purpose of the action which the person concerned intends to bring before the courts. In particular, the right to ask a court to review a declaration of incapacity is one of the most important rights for the person concerned since such a procedure, once initiated, will be decisive for the exercise of all the rights and freedoms affected by the declaration of incapacity, not least in relation to any restrictions that may be placed on the person's liberty (see also *Shtukaturov*, cited above, § 71). The Court therefore considers that this right is one of the fundamental procedural rights for the protection of those who have been partially deprived of legal capacity. It follows that such persons should in principle enjoy direct access to the courts in this sphere.

242. However, the State remains free to determine the procedure by which such direct access is to be realised. At the same time, the Court considers that it would not be incompatible with Article 6 for national legislation to provide for certain restrictions on access to court in this sphere, with the sole aim of ensuring that the courts are not overburdened with excessive and manifestly ill-founded applications. Nevertheless, it seems clear that this problem may be solved by other, less restrictive means than automatic denial of direct access, for example by limiting the

frequency with which applications may be made or introducing a system for prior examination of their admissibility on the basis of the file.

243. The Court further observes that eighteen of the twenty national legal systems studied in this context provide for direct access to the courts for any partially incapacitated persons wishing to have their status reviewed. In seventeen States such access is open even to those declared fully incapable (see paragraphs 88-90 above). This indicates that there is now a trend at European level towards granting legally incapacitated persons direct access to the courts to seek restoration of their capacity.

244. The Court is also obliged to note the growing importance which international instruments for the protection of people with mental disorders are now attaching to granting them as much legal autonomy as possible. It refers in this connection to the United Nations Convention of 13 December 2006 on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities and to Recommendation No. R (99) 4 of the Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe on principles concerning the legal protection of incapable adults, which recommend that adequate procedural safeguards be put in place to protect legally incapacitated persons to the greatest extent possible, to ensure periodic reviews of their status and to make appropriate remedies available (see paragraphs 72-73 above).

245. In the light of the foregoing, in particular the trends emerging in national legislation and the relevant international instruments, the Court considers that Article 6 § 1 of the Convention must be interpreted as guaranteeing in principle that anyone who has been declared partially incapable, as is the applicant's case, has direct access to a court to seek restoration of his or her legal capacity.

246. In the instant case the Court has observed that direct access of this kind is not guaranteed with a sufficient degree of certainty by the relevant Bulgarian legislation. That finding is sufficient for it to conclude that there has been a violation of Article 6 § 1 of the Convention in respect of the applicant.

247. The above conclusion dispenses the Court from examining whether the indirect legal remedies referred to by the Government provided the applicant with sufficient guarantees that his case would be brought before a court.

248. The Court therefore dismisses the Government's objection of failure to exhaust domestic remedies (see paragraph 223 above) and concludes that there has been a violation of Article 6 § 1 of the Convention.

VI. ALLEGED VIOLATION OF ARTICLE 8 OF THE CONVENTION TAKEN ALONE AND IN CONJUNCTION WITH ARTICLE 13

249. The applicant alleged that the restrictive guardianship regime, including his placement in the Pastra social care home and the physical

living conditions there, had amounted to unjustified interference with his right to respect for his private life and home. He submitted that Bulgarian law had not afforded him a sufficient and accessible remedy in that respect. He relied on Article 8 of the Convention taken alone and in conjunction with Article 13.

Article 8 provides:

“1. Everyone has the right to respect for his private and family life, his home and his correspondence.

2. There shall be no interference by a public authority with the exercise of this right except such as is in accordance with the law and is necessary in a democratic society in the interests of national security, public safety or the economic well-being of the country, for the prevention of disorder or crime, for the protection of health or morals, or for the protection of the rights and freedoms of others.”

250. The applicant maintained in particular that the guardianship regime had not been geared to his individual case but had entailed restrictions automatically imposed on anyone who had been declared incapable by a judge. He added that the fact of having to live in the Pastra social care home had effectively barred him from taking part in community life and from developing relations with persons of his choosing. The authorities had not attempted to find alternative therapeutic solutions in the community or to take measures that were less restrictive of his personal liberty, with the result that he had developed “institutionalisation syndrome”, that is, the loss of social skills and individual personality traits.

251. The Government contested those allegations.

252. Having regard to its conclusions under Articles 3, 5, 6 and 13 of the Convention, the Court considers that no separate issue arises under Article 8 of the Convention taken alone and/or in conjunction with Article 13. It is therefore unnecessary to examine this complaint.

VII. ARTICLES 46 AND 41 OF THE CONVENTION

A. Article 46 of the Convention

253. The relevant parts of Article 46 of the Convention read as follows:

“1. The High Contracting Parties undertake to abide by the final judgment of the Court in any case to which they are parties.

2. The final judgment of the Court shall be transmitted to the Committee of Ministers, which shall supervise its execution.”

254. The Court reiterates that by Article 46 of the Convention the Contracting Parties have undertaken to abide by the final judgments of the Court in any case to which they are parties, execution being supervised by the Committee of Ministers. It follows, *inter alia*, that a judgment in which the Court finds a breach of the Convention or the Protocols thereto imposes

on the respondent State a legal obligation not just to pay those concerned the sums awarded by way of just satisfaction, but also to choose, subject to supervision by the Committee of Ministers, the general and/or, if appropriate, individual measures to be adopted in their domestic legal order to put an end to the violation found by the Court and to redress as far as possible the effects (see *Menteş and Others v. Turkey* (Article 50), 24 July 1998, § 24, *Reports* 1998-IV; *Scozzari and Giunta v. Italy* [GC], nos. 39221/98 and 41963/98, § 249, ECHR 2000-VIII; and *Maestri v. Italy* [GC], no. 39748/98, § 47, ECHR 2004-I). The Court further notes that it is primarily for the State concerned to choose, subject to supervision by the Committee of Ministers, the means to be used in its domestic legal order to discharge its obligation under Article 46 of the Convention (see *Scozzari and Giunta*, cited above; *Brumărescu v. Romania* (just satisfaction) [GC], no. 28342/95, § 20, ECHR 2001-I; and *Öcalan v. Turkey* [GC], no. 46221/99, § 210, ECHR 2005-IV).

255. However, with a view to helping the respondent State to fulfil its obligations under Article 46, the Court may seek to indicate the type of individual and/or general measures that might be taken in order to put an end to the situation it has found to exist (see *Broniowski v. Poland* [GC], no. 31443/96, § 194, ECHR 2004-V, and *Scoppola v. Italy (no. 2)* [GC], no. 10249/03, § 148, 17 September 2009).

256. In the instant case the Court considers that it is necessary, in view of its finding of a violation of Article 5, to indicate individual measures for the execution of this judgment. It observes that it has found a violation of that Article on account of the failure to comply with the requirement that any deprivation of liberty must be “in accordance with a procedure prescribed by law” and the lack of justification for the applicant’s deprivation of liberty under sub-paragraph (e) or any of the other sub-paragraphs of Article 5 § 1. It has also noted deficiencies in the assessment of the presence and persistence of any disorders warranting placement in a social care home (see paragraphs 148-60 above).

257. The Court considers that in order to redress the effects of the breach of the applicant’s rights, the authorities should ascertain whether he wishes to remain in the home in question. Nothing in this judgment should be seen as an obstacle to his continued placement in the Pastra social care home or any other home for people with mental disorders if it is established that he consents to the placement. However, should the applicant object to such placement, the authorities should re-examine his situation without delay in the light of the findings of this judgment.

258. The Court notes that it has also found a violation of Article 6 § 1 on account of the lack of direct access to a court for a person who has been partially deprived of legal capacity with a view to seeking its restoration (see paragraphs 233-48 above). Having regard to that finding, the Court

recommends that the respondent State envisage the necessary general measures to ensure the effective possibility of such access.

B. Article 41 of the Convention

259. Article 41 of the Convention provides:

“If the Court finds that there has been a violation of the Convention or the Protocols thereto, and if the internal law of the High Contracting Party concerned allows only partial reparation to be made, the Court shall, if necessary, afford just satisfaction to the injured party.”

1. Damage

260. The applicant did not submit any claims in respect of pecuniary damage but sought 64,000 euros (EUR) for non-pecuniary damage.

261. He asserted in particular that he had endured poor living conditions in the social care home and claimed a sum of EUR 14,000 on that account. In respect of his placement in the Pastra social care home, he stated that he had experienced feelings of anxiety, distress and frustration ever since that measure had begun to be implemented in December 2002. His enforced placement in the home had also had a significant impact on his life as he had been removed from his social environment and subjected to a very restrictive regime, making it harder for him to reintegrate into the community. He submitted that although there was no comparable case-law concerning unlawful detention in a social care home for people with mental disorders, regard should be had to the just satisfaction awarded by the Court in cases involving unlawful detention in psychiatric institutions. He referred, for example, to the judgments in *Gajcsi v. Hungary* (no. 34503/03, §§ 28-30, 3 October 2006) and *Kayadjieva v. Bulgaria* (no. 56272/00, § 57, 28 September 2006), while noting that he had been deprived of his liberty for a considerably longer period than the applicants in the above-mentioned cases. He submitted that a sum of EUR 30,000 would constitute an equitable award on that account. Lastly, he added that his lack of access to the courts to seek a review of his legal status had restricted the exercise of a number of freedoms in the sphere of his private life, causing additional non-pecuniary damage, for which an award of EUR 20,000 could provide redress.

262. The Government submitted that the applicant's claims were excessive and unfounded. They argued that if the Court were to make any award in respect of non-pecuniary damage, it should not exceed the amounts awarded in judgments against Bulgaria concerning compulsory psychiatric admission. The Government referred to the judgments in *Kayadjieva* (cited above, § 57), *Varbanov* (cited above, § 67), and *Kepenerov v. Bulgaria* (no. 39269/98, § 42, 31 July 2003).

263. The Court observes that it has found violations of several provisions of the Convention in the present case, namely Articles 3, 5 (§§ 1, 4 and 5), 6 and 13. It considers that the applicant must have endured suffering as a result of his placement in the home, which began in December 2002 and is still ongoing, his inability to secure a judicial review of that measure and his lack of access to a court to apply for release from partial guardianship. This suffering undoubtedly aroused in him a feeling of helplessness and anxiety. The Court further considers that the applicant sustained non-pecuniary damage on account of the degrading living conditions he had to endure for more than seven years.

264. Ruling on an equitable basis, as required by Article 41 of the Convention, the Court considers that the applicant should be awarded an aggregate sum of EUR 15,000 in respect of non-pecuniary damage.

2. Costs and expenses

265. The applicant did not submit any claims in respect of costs and expenses.

3. Default interest

266. The Court considers it appropriate that the default interest rate should be based on the marginal lending rate of the European Central Bank, to which should be added three percentage points.

FOR THESE REASONS, THE COURT

1. *Dismisses* unanimously the Government's preliminary objections of failure to exhaust domestic remedies;
2. *Holds* unanimously that there has been a violation of Article 5 § 1 of the Convention;
3. *Holds* unanimously that there has been a violation of Article 5 § 4 of the Convention;
4. *Holds* unanimously that there has been a violation of Article 5 § 5 of the Convention;
5. *Holds* unanimously that there has been a violation of Article 3 of the Convention, taken alone and in conjunction with Article 13;
6. *Holds* unanimously that there has been a violation of Article 6 § 1 of the Convention;

7. *Holds* by thirteen votes to four that it is not necessary to examine whether there has been a violation of Article 8 of the Convention, taken alone and in conjunction with Article 13;
8. *Holds* unanimously
 - (a) that the respondent State is to pay the applicant, within three months, EUR 15,000 (fifteen thousand euros) in respect of non-pecuniary damage, to be converted into Bulgarian leva at the rate applicable at the date of settlement, plus any tax that may be chargeable;
 - (b) that from the expiry of the above-mentioned three months until settlement simple interest shall be payable on the above amount at a rate equal to the marginal lending rate of the European Central Bank during the default period plus three percentage points;
9. *Dismisses* unanimously the remainder of the applicant's claim for just satisfaction.

Done in English and in French, and delivered at a public hearing in the Human Rights Building, Strasbourg, on 17 January 2012.

Vincent Berger
Jurisconsult

Nicolas Bratza
President

In accordance with Article 45 § 2 of the Convention and Rule 74 § 2 of the Rules of Court, the following separate opinions are annexed to this judgment:

- (a) joint partly dissenting opinion of Judges Tulkens, Spielmann and Laffranque;
- (b) partly dissenting opinion of Judge Kalaydjieva.

N.B.
V.B.

JOINT PARTLY DISSENTING OPINION OF JUDGES
TULKENS, SPIELMANN AND LAFFRANQUE

(Translation)

We had no hesitation in voting in favour of finding a violation of Article 5 and of Article 3 taken alone and in conjunction with Article 13. We also voted in favour of finding a violation of Article 6 of the Convention, and we believe that the judgment is likely to strengthen considerably the protection of persons in a similarly vulnerable situation to the applicant. However, we do not agree with the majority's finding that no separate issue arises under Article 8 of the Convention, taken alone and/or in conjunction with Article 13, and that it is therefore unnecessary to examine this complaint (see paragraph 252 of the judgment and point 7 of the operative provisions).

We wish to point out that the applicant alleged that the restrictive guardianship regime, including his placement in the Pastra social care home and the physical living conditions there, amounted to unjustified interference with his right to respect for his private life and home (see paragraph 249 of the judgment). He submitted that Bulgarian law had not afforded him a sufficient and accessible remedy in that respect. He also maintained that the guardianship regime had not been geared to his individual case but had entailed restrictions automatically imposed on anyone who had been declared incapable by a judge. He added that the fact of having to live in the Pastra social care home had effectively barred him from taking part in community life and from developing relations with persons of his choosing. The authorities had not attempted to find alternative therapeutic solutions in the community or to take measures that were less restrictive of his personal liberty, with the result that he had developed "institutionalisation syndrome", that is, the loss of social skills and individual personality traits (see paragraph 250 of the judgment).

In our opinion, these are genuine issues that deserved to be examined separately. Admittedly, a large part of the allegations submitted under Article 8 are similar to those raised under Articles 3, 5 and 6. Nevertheless, they are not identical and the answers given in the judgment in relation to those provisions cannot entirely cover the complaints brought under Articles 8 and 13.

More specifically, an issue that would also have merited a separate examination concerns the scope of a periodic review of the applicant's situation. He submitted that domestic law did not provide for an automatic periodic assessment of the need to maintain a measure restricting legal capacity. It might have been helpful to consider whether States have a positive obligation to set up a review procedure of this kind, especially in situations where the persons concerned are unable to comprehend the

consequences of a regular review and cannot themselves initiate a procedure to that end.

PARTLY DISSENTING OPINION OF JUDGE KALAYDJIEVA

I had no hesitation in reaching the conclusions concerning Mr Stanev's complaints under Articles 5, 3 and 6 of the Convention. However, like Judges Tulkens, Spielmann and Laffranque, I regret the majority's conclusion that in view of these findings it was not necessary to examine separately his complaints under Article 8 concerning "the [partial-guardianship] system, including the lack of regular reviews of the continued justification of such a measure, the appointment of the Director of the Pastra social care home as his [guardian] and the alleged lack of scrutiny of the Director's decisions, and also about the restrictions on his private life resulting from his admission to the home against his will, extending to the lack of contact with the outside world and the conditions attached to correspondence" (see paragraph 90 of the decision as to admissibility of 29 June 2010). In my view the applicant's complaints under Article 8 of the Convention remain the primary issue in the present case.

In its earlier case-law the Court has expressed the view that an individual's legal capacity is decisive for the exercise of all the rights and freedoms, not least in relation to any restrictions that may be placed on the person's liberty (see *Shtukaturov v. Russia*, no. 44009/05, § 71, ECHR 2008; *Salontaji-Drobnjak v. Serbia*, no. 36500/05, §§ 140 et seq., 13 October 2009; and the recent judgment in *X and Y v. Croatia*, no. 5193/09, §§ 102-04, 3 November 2011).

There is hardly any doubt that restrictions on legal capacity constitute interference with the right to private life, which will give rise to a breach of Article 8 of the Convention unless it can be shown that it was "in accordance with the law", pursued one or more legitimate aims and was "necessary" for their attainment.

Unlike the situation of the applicants in the cases mentioned above, Mr Stanev's capacity to perform ordinary acts relating to everyday life and his ability to enter validly into legal transactions with the consent of his guardian were recognised. The national law and the domestic courts' decisions entitled him to request and obtain social care in accordance with his needs and preferences if he so wished, or to refuse such care in view of the quality of the services offered and/or any restrictions involved which he was not prepared to accept. There was nothing in the domestic law or the applicant's personal circumstances to justify any further restrictions, or to warrant the substitution of his own will with his guardian's assessment of his best interests.

However, once declared partially incapacitated, he was divested of the possibility of acting in his own interests and there were insufficient guarantees to prevent his *de facto* treatment as a fully incapacitated individual. It has not been contested that he was not consulted as to whether

he wished to avail himself of placement in a social care institution and that he was not even entitled to decide independently how to spend his time or the remaining part of his pension, and whether and when to visit his friends or relatives or other places, to send and receive letters or to otherwise communicate with the outside world. No justification was offered for the fact that Mr Stanev was stripped of the ability to act in accordance with his preferences to the extent determined by the courts and the law and that, instead of due assistance from his officially appointed guardian, the pursuit of his best interests was made completely dependent on the good will or neglect shown by the guardian. In this regard the lack of respect for the applicant's recognised personal autonomy violated Mr Stanev's right to personal life and dignity as guaranteed by Article 8 and failed to meet contemporary standards for ensuring the necessary respect for the wishes and preferences he was capable of expressing.

The applicant's situation was further aggravated by his inability to trigger any remedy for the independent protection of his rights and interests. Any attempt to avail himself of such remedies depended on the initial approval of Mr Stanev's guardian, who also acted as the Director and representative of the social care institution. In this regard the majority's preference not to consider separately the applicant's complaints under Article 8 resulted in a failure to subject to separate scrutiny the absence of safeguards for the exercise of these rights in the face of a potential or even evident conflict of interests, a factor which appears to be of central importance for the requisite protection of vulnerable individuals against possible abuse and is equally pertinent to the applicant's complaints under Article 8 and Article 6.

While both parties submitted information to the effect that proceedings for the restoration of capacity were not only possible in principle, but had also been successful in a reasonable percentage of cases, Mr Stanev rightly complained that the institution of such proceedings in his case depended on his guardian's approval. It appears that the guardian's discretion to block any attempt to take proceedings in court affected not only the applicant's right of access to court for the purposes of restoration of capacity, but also prevented the institution of any proceedings in pursuit of the applicant's interests and rights, including those protected under Article 5 of the Convention. As was also submitted by his representatives before the national authorities, Mr Stanev "should have [had] the opportunity to assess by himself whether or not, having regard to the living conditions at the home, it was in his interests to remain there" (see paragraph 38 of the judgment).