

# **Comparative Human Rights Law**

**Carolina Academic Press**  
**Comparative Law Series**

Michael Louis Corrado  
Series Editor

*Comparative Constitutional Review*  
*Cases and Materials*  
Michael Louis Corrado

*Comparative Law: An Introduction*  
Vivian Grosswald Curran

*Comparative Consumer Bankruptcy*  
Jason Kilborn

*Comparative Law of Contracts*  
Alain Levasseur

*Comparative Criminal Procedure, Second Edition*  
Stephen C. Thaman

*Comparative Human Rights Law, Vol. 1:*  
*Expression, Association, Religion*  
Arthur Mark Weisburd

*Comparative Human Rights Law, Vol. 2:*  
*Detention, Prosecution, Capital Punishment*  
Arthur Mark Weisburd

# Comparative Human Rights Law

---

Detention, Prosecution,  
Capital Punishment

*Volume 2*

**A. Mark Weisburd**

MARTHA M. BRANDIS PROFESSOR OF LAW  
UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA AT CHAPEL HILL

CAROLINA ACADEMIC PRESS

Durham, North Carolina

Copyright © 2008  
A. Mark Weisburd  
All Rights Reserved

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Weisburd, A. Mark (Arthur Mark), 1948-  
Comparative human rights law : detention, prosecution, capital punishment  
/ by Arthur Mark Weisburd.

p. cm.

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 13: 978-1-59460-441-6 ISBN 10: 1-59460-441-X (alk. paper)

1. Criminal procedure. 2. Detention of persons. 3. Human rights. I. Title.  
K5401.W45 2008  
341.4'8--dc22

2007049902

CAROLINA ACADEMIC PRESS  
700 Kent Street  
Durham, North Carolina 27701  
Telephone (919) 489-7486  
Fax (919) 493-5668  
[www.cap-press.com](http://www.cap-press.com)

Printed in the United States of America

To My Wife



# Contents

---

Table of Authorities	xi
Preface	xxi
The Aim of This Book	xxi
The Book's Structure	xxii
Usage Conventions	xxiv
Translations	xxv
Acknowledgments	xxvii
<b>Chapter One Non-United States Legal Systems</b>	<b>3</b>
A. Introduction	3
B. Japan	3
C. The European Human Rights System	7
1. The Council of Europe	7
2. The European Court of Human Rights	8
Editor's Comment: Compliance with the Court's Judgments	13
D. India	14
<b>Chapter Two Habeas Corpus</b>	<b>17</b>
A. Japan	17
1. [Denial of an Application for a Writ of Habeas Corpus]	17
B. The European Human Rights System	18
1. Cases of <i>De Wilde, Ooms and Versyp</i> ("Vagrancy") v. <i>Belgium, European Court of Human Rights</i>	18
2. <i>Case of Weeks v. the United Kingdom</i>	24
C. India	29
1. General Observations	29
2. <i>A.K. Gopalan v. State of Madras; Union of India,</i> <i>Intervener</i>	30
D. The United States	42
1. <i>Immigration and Naturalization Service v. Enrico St. Cyr</i>	42

<b>Chapter Three</b>	<b>Criminal Procedure</b>	51
A.	Japan	51
1.	Right to Counsel	51
a.	Judgment on the Right of the Suspect in Criminal Procedure to Communicate with the Defence Counsel	51
2.	Limitations on Interrogation Methods	56
a.	Decision Concerning the Case in which the Interrogation over Long Hours of the Suspect Was Ruled Not to Have Transgressed Permissible Limits of Non-Compulsory Investigation	56
b.	Decision upon the Case Concerning: (1) Limits on the Use of Physical Force in Voluntary Investigations; (2) Use of Physical Force in Voluntary Investigations Deemed to Be Permissible	60
B.	The European Human Rights System	64
1.	Drawing Inferences from Defendant's Silence; Questioning Defendant without Access to an Attorney	64
a.	In the Case of <i>John Murray v. the United Kingdom</i>	64
2.	Right to Confront Witnesses	75
a.	<i>Van Mechelen and Others v. the Netherlands</i>	75
C.	India	83
1.	Interrogation: Right to Confront Witnesses; Right to Silence	83
a.	<i>Kartar Singh v. State of Punjab</i>	83
2.	Right to Counsel	103
a.	<i>Hussainara Khatoon and Others (IV) v. Home Secretary, State of Bihar, Patna</i>	103
D.	The United States	108
1.	Self-Incrimination; Right to Counsel; Police Interrogation	108
a.	<i>Miranda v. State of Arizona</i>	108
2.	Right to Confront Witnesses	128
a.	<i>Michael D. Crawford, Petitioner v. Washington</i>	128
<b>Chapter Four</b>	<b>Capital Punishment</b>	147
A.	Japan	147
1.	Judgment upon the Case Concerning That an Appeals Court Judgment That Maintained the Sentence of Life Imprisonment in the First Instance Court Judgment Was Quashed Because the Sentence Period Was Considered Inappropriate	147
B.	The European Human Rights System	152
	Note on the Death Penalty in Europe	152



C.	India	154
1.	<i>Bachan Singh v. State of Punjab</i>	154
D.	The United States	182
1.	<i>Gregg v. Georgia</i>	182
<b>Appendix Relevant Provisions of Applicable Legal Instruments</b>		197
A.	Japan	197
1.	Constitution	197
2.	Statutes	198
a.	Code of Criminal Procedure	198
b.	Habeas Corpus Law	199
c.	Habeas Corpus Rules	199
d.	Penal Code	200
B.	European Human Rights System	200
1.	European Convention on Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, November 4, 1950	200
2.	Protocol No. 6 to the Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms Concerning the Abolition of the Death Penalty, April 28, 1983	203
C.	India	204
1.	Constitution	204
2.	Statutes	208
a.	Code of Criminal Procedure	208
b.	Evidence Act, 1872	210
c.	Penal Code	211
d.	Preventive Detention Act, 1950	212
e.	Terrorists and Disruptive Activities (Prevention) Act, 1987	215
D.	The United States	218
1.	Constitution of the United States	218
2.	United States Code	219
Bibliography		223
Index		225



# Table of Authorities

---

---

## Japan

### Cases

Decision Concerning the Admissibility as Evidence of the On-the-Spot Inspection Report Recording the Scenes of Victimization and Perpetration Reproduced by the Victim or the Suspect as Instructed by the Investigating Officers, in Cases Where It May Be Understood That the Existence of the Criminal Fact So Reproduced Is Essentially the Fact Required to Be Established in Order to Prove the Charge, 55

Decision concerning the case in which the interrogation over long hours of the suspect was ruled not to have transgressed permissible limits of non-compulsory investigation, 56

Decision of August 1, 1951, 63

Decision upon the case concerning: (1) limits on the use of physical force in voluntary investigations; (2) use of physical force in voluntary investigations deemed to be permissible, 60

Judgment on the right of the suspect in criminal procedure to communicate with the defence counsel, 51

Judgment upon the case concerning that an appeals court judgment that maintained the sentence of life imprisonment in the first instance court judgment was quashed because the sentence period was considered inappropriate, 147

Judgment Upon the Case Concerning the Relationship Between Evidential Capacity of a Confession Provoked by a Fraudulent Means and Article 38(2) of the Constitution of Japan, 63

[Denial of an Application for a Writ of Habeas Corpus], 17

### Constitution

Article 9, 4

Article 33, 18

Article 34, 18, 51–52, 54

Article 37, 51–52  
Article 38, 53–55, 63  
Article 41, 5  
Article 58, 7  
Article 76, 5–6  
Article 77, 5, 7  
Article 81, 5  
Article 94, 7

**Statutes**

*Code of Criminal Procedure*

Article 39, 51–55  
Article 197, 56–63  
Article 198, 53, 56–63

*Habeas Corpus Law*

Article 2, 17

*Habeas Corpus Rules*

Article 4, 17

## **European Human Rights System**

**Cases**

Case of Weeks v. the United Kingdom, 24  
Cases of De Wilde, Ooms and Versyp, 18  
In the case of John Murray v. the United Kingdom, 64  
Van Mechelen and Others v. the Netherlands, 75

**European Convention on Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms**

Article 5, 20–29  
Article 6, 64–83  
Article 8, 80  
Protocol 1, 9  
Protocol 2, 9  
Protocol 4, 9  
Protocol 6, 9, 152–153  
Protocol 7, 9  
Protocol 9, 9  
Protocol 11, 8–10, 152  
Protocol 12, 9  
Protocol 13, 9

## Official Reports

Council of Europe, *Implementation of judgments of the European Court of Human Rights: Court Judgments Pending Before the Committee of Ministers for Control of Execution for More than Five Years, or Otherwise Raising Important Issues*, AS/Jur (2005) 32, 9 June 2005, 13

Council of Europe, *Implementation of judgments of the European Court of Human Rights: Supplementary Introductory Memorandum (Revised)*, AS/Jur (2005) 55, 20 December 2005, 13

## India

### Cases

**A.K. Gopalan v. State of Madras; Union of India, Intervener**, 30, 158–159

A. K. Roy, Etc v. Union of India and Another, 41

**Bachan Singh v. State of Punjab**, 154

Bhuboni Sahu v. King, 87

Dr. Ram Krishan Bhardwaj v. State of Delhi and Others, 41

Dr. Ram Manohar Lohia's case, 159

Ebrahim Vazir Mavat v. State of Bombay and Others (With Connected Appeals), 29

Fatehchand Himmatlal v. State of Maharashtra, 158

Gunupati Keshavram Reddy v. Nafisul Hasan and The State of Uttar Pradesh, 29

Gurbachan Singh v. State of Bombay, 89

Hari Charan Kurmi and Jogia Hajam v. State of Bihar, 87

Hira Nath Mishra v. Principal, Rajendra Medical College, Ranchi, 100

**Hussainara Khatoon and Others (IV) v. Home Secretary, State of Bihar, Patna**, 103

Jagmohan Singh v. State of Uttar Pradesh, 154–156, 161, 162, 163, 172, 174, 175, 176, 177, 178

Jayanarayan Sukul v. State of West Bengal, 41

Kanu Sanyal v. District Magistrate, Darjeejng and Others, 29

**Kartar Singh v. State of Punjab**, 83

Maneka Gandhi v. Union of India, 42, 160, 170

M.H. Hoskot v. State of Maharashtra, 104

Machindar Shivaji Mahar v. The King, 39

Nandini Satpathy v. Dani (P.L.) and Another, 107

Olga Tellis v. Bombay Municipal Corpn, 88

Rajendra Prasad v. State of U.P., 154–156, 171, 178, 180

R. C. Cooper v. Union of India, 159

Sheela Barse v. State of Maharashtra, 106

State of Bombay v. Atma Ram Sridhar Viadya, 41  
State of Bombay v. R. M. D. Chamarbaugwala, 158  
State of Maharashtra v. Sidhi, 173  
Vijay Narain Singh v. Bihar, 41

**Constitution**

Article 13, 30  
Article 14, 87, 93, 96, 103, 104–106, 155, 170, 172, 175–177, 180  
Article 19, 30, 31, 155, 157–162, 169–170, 172, 177, 180  
Article 20, 31, 38, 90–91, 107  
Article 21, 30, 31–32, 38, 41–42, 87, 91, 92, 95–96, 104–106, 155, 158,  
169–170, 172, 176–177, 180  
Article 22, 30, 29–41, 91  
Article 32, 30–31, 156  
Article 39-A, 105–106  
Article 72, 170  
Article 134, 171  
Article 136, 174  
Article 145, 15  
Article 161, 170  
Article 246, 29–30, 34  
Seventh Schedule, List I, Item 9, 29, 31–32, 37  
Seventh Schedule, List III, Item 1, 170  
Seventh Schedule, List III, Item 2, 170  
Seventh Schedule, List III, Item 3, 29, 31–32, 37

**Statutes**

*Code of Criminal Procedure*

Section 162, 87, 91  
Section 164, 87, 91–92, 96–97  
Section 235, 169, 172, 176, 178–181  
Section 354, 154–155, 157, 162, 169, 171–172, 175–176, 178–181  
Section 366, 173  
Section 367, 173  
Section 368, 173  
Section 369, 173  
Section 370, 173  
Section 379, 174  
Section 432, 173  
Section 433, 173  
Section 433-A, 173

*Evidence Act*

Section 3, 87

Section 24, 91, 93  
 Section 25, 87, 91  
 Section 26, 87, 91  
 Section 27, 91  
 Section 30, 87, 91, 94, 96

*Penal Code*

Section 299, 160  
 Section 300, 160  
 Section 302, 154–155, 157–162, 169–171, 174–176, 180, 181  
 Section 303, 174

*Preventive Detention Act, 1950*

Section 3, 30, 34–35, 37–38  
 Section 7, 35, 39  
 Section 9, 35  
 Section 10, 36  
 Section 11, 37  
 Section 12, 35, 37–40  
 Section 13, 38  
 Section 14, 39–40

*Terrorists and Disruptive Activities (Prevention) Act, 1987*

Section 3, 96  
 Section 15, 86–90, 93, 96–97, 103  
 Section 16, 98–101, 103  
 Section 20, 97  
 Section 21, 87–88, 90, 95–96

**Government Reports**

Law Commission, 35th Report, 1967, 161, 162, 164–165, 169  
 National Police Commission, 4th Report, 1980, 93

**United States**

**Cases—Federal**

*Supreme Court*

Blackburn v. State of Alabama, 109  
 Bourjaily v. United States, 138  
 Bram v. United States, 113  
 Brown v. United States, 128  
 California v. Stewart, 111, 122, 126

Carmell v. Texas, 133  
Carnley v. Cochran, 117  
Chambers v. State of Florida, 112, 128  
Coy v. Iowa, 131  
**Crawford v. Washington**, 128  
Cruz v. New York, 139  
Dutton v. Evans, 136  
Escobedo v. State of Illinois, 114, 115, 119, 120, 123, 126, 127  
Fare v. Michael C, 128  
Felker v. Turpin, 45, 49  
Frazier v. Cupp, 128  
Furman v. Georgia, 167, 174, 177, 179, 185–196  
Gideon v. Wainwright, 105, 118, 127  
Gore v. United States, 187  
**Gregg v. Georgia**, 177, 178, 182  
Griffin v. California, 127  
Hamdi v. Rumsfeld, 49  
Haynes v. State of Washington, 111  
Heikkila v. Barber, 45, 46, 48  
**Immigration and Naturalization Service v. Enrico St. Cyr**, 42, 49  
Jay v. Boyd, 47  
Argersinger v. Hamlin, 105  
Lee v. Illinois, 139  
Lilly v. Virginia, 138, 142  
Lockett v. Ohio, 127  
Lynumn v. State of Illinois, 110  
Malloy v. Hogan, 114  
Mapp v. Ohio, 115  
Mattox v. United States, 137, 138  
**Miranda v. State of Arizona**, 108, 129  
Ohio v. Roberts, 130, 131, 138–144  
Parker v. Randolph, 139  
Pointer v. Texas, 131  
Rasul v. Bush, 49  
Reynolds v. United States, 141  
Ring v. Arizona, 144  
Robinson v. California, 186  
Townsend v. Sain, 110  
Trop v. Dulles, 186  
United States ex rel. Accardi v. Shaughnessy, 47  
United States v. Robinson, 127  
Vignera v. New York, 111, 124  
Weems v. United States, 185



Westover v. United States, 111, 114, 125

White v. Illinois, 136, 139, 140

Williams v. New York, 189

Ziang Sung Wan v. United States, 113

*United States Courts of Appeals*

United States v. Grunewald, 112

United States v. Photogrammetric Data Servs., Inc., 141

**Cases—State**

*California*

People v. Anderson, 189

*Colorado*

People v. Farrell, 141

Stevens v. People, 142

*Georgia*

Coley v. State, 192, 195

Moore v. State, 195

*Massachusetts*

Commonwealth v. O’Neal, 189

*North Carolina*

State v. Webb, 135

*South Carolina*

State v. Campbell, 135, 137

*Virginia*

Nowlin v. Commonwealth, 142

*Wisconsin*

State v. Bintz, 142

**Constitution**

Article I, § 9, cl 2, 45

Fifth Amendment, 90, 108, 111, 112–121, 123, 125, 127, 188

Sixth Amendment, 127–128, 131, 134–144

Seventh Amendment, 144

Eighth Amendment, 167, 174, 182, 183, 185–189, 191, 193

Fourteenth Amendment, 127, 167, 182, 183, 185, 187, 188, 191, 193

**Statutes—Federal**

*Title 10, United States Code*

Section 801, 50

Section 948a, 50

*Title 28, United States Code*

Section 2241, 42, 44–49, 50

Section 2254, 50

*Detainee Treatment Act of 2005*

Section 1005, 50

*Military Commissions Act of 2006*

Section 3, 50

Section 7, 50

Section 10, 50

**Statutes—State**

*Georgia*

§ 27-2534.1, 194

## Miscellaneous

**Cases—United Kingdom**

Fenwick’s Case, 133

King v. Paine, 133

Lord Morley’s Case, 133

Queen v. Beeston, 134

Thompson v. Trevanion, 139

**Statutes—United Kingdom**

13 Charles 2, c. 1, § 5 (1661), 133

5 George 3, c. 12, § 57 (1765), 134

1 & 2 Philip & Mary, c. 13 (1554), 132, 133

2 & 3 Philip & Mary, c. 10 (1555), 132, 133

11 & 12 Victoria, c. 42, § 17 (1848), 134

**Books**

Blackstone, William, *Commentaries on the Laws of England* (1768), 132, 140

Brett, Peter, *An Enquiry into Criminal Guilt* (1963 Edition), 166

Chhabra, Kirpal Singh, *Quantum of Punishment in Criminal Law in India*, 165

Dean, Meryll, *Japanese Legal System* (Second Edition), 3

Douglas, David C. (ed.), *English Historical Documents* (1955), 134

Elliot, Jonathan, *The debates of the several state conventions on the adoption of the federal Constitution, as recommended by the general convention at Philadelphia, in 1787* (2d ed. 1863), 134

Hale, Sir Matthew, *History and Analysis of the Common Law of England* (1713), 140–141

- \_\_\_\_\_, *Pleas of the Crown* (1736), 132, 133, 137
- Hawkins, William, *Pleas of the Crown* (T. Leach 6th ed. 1787), 133
- Holdsworth, Sir William, *History of English Law* (3d ed. 1944), 132
- Howell, Thomas Bayly, *A Complete Collection of State Trials and Proceedings: from the Earliest Period to the Year 1783 and Continued from the Year 1783 to the Present Time* (1816–1828), 132, 133, 141
- Jardine, David, *Criminal Trials* (1832), 132, 137
- Langbein, John H., *Prosecuting Crime in the Renaissance* (1974), 132, 137
- Oppler, Alfred C., *Legal Reform in Occupied Japan: A Participant Looks Back* (1976), 5
- Perry, Richard L. and John C. Cooper (eds.), *Sources of Our Liberties* (1959), 134
- Schwartz, Bernard, *The Bill of Rights: A Documentary History* (1971), 134, 135
- Stephen, Sir James. F., *History of the Criminal Law of England* (1883), 132, 137
- Wigmore on Evidence (2d ed. 1923), 131, 133, 136, 138
- Wigmore on Evidence (McNaughton rev. 1961), 112
- Wroth, L. Kinvin and Hiller B. Zobel (eds.), *Legal Papers of John Adams* (1965), 134

#### Articles and Book Chapters

- Beer, Lawrence W., “Constitutional Revolution in Japanese Law, Society and Politics,” 16 *Modern Asian Studies* 33 (1982), 3
- Herrmann, Frank R., S.J. and Brownlow Speer, “Facing the Accuser: Ancient and Medieval Precursors of the Confrontation Clause,” 34 *Virginia Journal of International Law* 481 (1994), 131
- Kirst, Roger W., “Appellate Court Answers to the Confrontation Questions in *Lilly v. Virginia*,” 53 *Syracuse Law Review* 87 (2003), 142
- Okudaira, Y., “Forty Years of the Constitution and Its Various Influences: Japanese, American and European,” at *Japanese Constitutional Law* 20 (Percy R. Luney and Kazuyuki Takahashi eds. 1976), 5
- Pollitt, Daniel H., “The Right of Confrontation: Its History and Modern Dress,” 8 *Journal of Public Law* 381 (1959), 134



# Preface

---

## The Aim of This Book

This book is intended to introduce American law students to variations in approaches to human rights in several of the more important legal systems of the world. The key word in the previous sentence is “introduce.” The subject is so vast, and the range of relevant law so great, that a comprehensive discussion of the subject would require many volumes. Nonetheless, it is possible even in a relatively brief work to provide a sense of the ways different societies provide legal protections for their members.

This work is intended to permit comparisons, but its brevity required focusing its coverage. Therefore, the cases in this work are drawn from only four legal systems; the hope is that the possibility of gaining some overall sense of the workings of each of these systems compensates for the narrowness of this approach. Selection was dictated by three factors. First, there seemed to be no point in considering cases from countries where the courts are either ignored or lacking in independence. Second, allowing for the first consideration, it was crucial to examine a variety of legal systems. Finally, it was necessary to focus on systems from which case reports were available in English. Accordingly, the legal systems addressed in this work are the Japanese system, showing the approach of a developed, non-Western country; the European human rights system, illustrating rights thinking in a system sharing with the United States many values regarding the relationship between individuals and society; the Indian system, interesting because it reflects the work of an active and fairly effective court system operating in a developing, non-Western country; and, finally, the United States’ system, with which students are likely to be most familiar and which can provide a benchmark.

Again, to facilitate comparison, only a limited number of rights are addressed, even taking into account the companion volume to this one. All are so-called first generation rights, addressing civil and political protections; all

were chosen from among those that seem so basic as to be essential to any system of rights protection.

This volume addresses the right to the writ of habeas corpus, various rights relating to criminal procedure, and the death penalty. Habeas corpus is part of the foundation of government by law. So long as an individual can force government to demonstrate a legal basis for confinement, arbitrary detention can be controlled. The procedures governments must follow in order to impose criminal penalties on individuals are also fundamental protections of freedom. The range of issues which could be addressed under this heading is vast. The discussion in this volume has focused on three issues which bear heavily on protection of individuals: the nature of the right to counsel in a given system, the extent of the right against self-incrimination, and—what is essentially the obverse of the foregoing issue—the limitations the police are obliged to observe in interrogating criminal suspects. Finally, this volume addresses the different attitudes toward the death penalty taken in the different legal systems discussed in this volume. Given the intensity of opinions on this subject, it seemed useful to provide an indication of the range of views regarding capital punishment taken in different parts of the world.

The first chapter of this book provides introductions to the legal system of Japan, to the European human rights system, and to India's legal system. These brief discussions are aimed at explaining to students the structure of each of those systems, and the importance of judicial opinions in them. The following chapters address the rights listed above.

It should be noted that, while all cases from the European Court of Human Rights and the Supreme Courts of India and the United States are available from English-language data bases, decisions of the Supreme Court of Japan are available in English only in a limited selection on that Court's website and also from translations made for various purposes and published, the cases being selected for translation according to the translator's criteria. Since the editor does not read Japanese, it is possible that significant Japanese cases do not appear in this work; nonetheless, the discussion is believed to be reasonably complete.

## **The Book's Structure**

This book includes a relatively small number of lightly-edited—and therefore, in many cases, lengthy—excerpts from judicial decisions, a limited number of notes providing information regarding particular legal systems' treatment of issues not adequately addressed in any decision, and an appendix of

legal instruments relevant to decisions making up the book. It therefore differs from many casebooks in its lack of textual material, its omission of questions intended to provoke thought, and in the necessarily limited scope of the issues raised by the decisions set out. It may be useful to explain why the book was structured in this way.

The series of which this book is a part aims at providing relatively short books which may be used to focus discussion in comparative law classes on particular topics. Since books in this series cannot be lengthy, editors do not have the luxury of resolving doubts by including material not deemed to be essential. That fact, in turn, forces editors to decide what exactly is essential in the context of particular works.

The subject of this book is comparative human rights, so it is obviously essential to present cases addressing a range of rights from a range of different legal systems. While, as noted above, the length of the book limits both the number of rights and the number of legal systems which may be addressed, one possible way of dealing with this circumstance would have been to include much shorter excerpts from a greater number of cases, as well as explanatory textual material. That approach, however, would have worked against what seemed to be a second essential element of the book.

That element relates to the purposes of the study of comparative law. While one such purpose is of course to convey to students the differences in substantive law between systems, there are others which are also important. One of those additional purposes is to permit students to get a sense of the styles of legal reasoning used in different legal systems. What sorts of arguments are legitimate? What counts as a conclusive argument? Yet another purpose is to permit students to reflect upon the unarticulated assumptions underlying each legal system—ideas about how the world works seen as so fundamental in each system that they do not require explanation, or indeed, as so very basic that it would never occur to judges that there was any other way to think about legal issues. These latter aims cannot be achieved if students are provided only with snippets of decisions setting out rules of law, but omitting either a description of the facts different courts saw as crucial to their decisions or the way those courts' own explanation of their reasoning about the facts. While textual materials and leading questions following cases might provide information to students on those subjects, that approach would seem to defeat the purpose of a casebook—that is, to force students themselves to read cases carefully in order to understand all that each case can teach. But if a short book is to present excerpts from cases long enough to permit students to see how different courts reason about difficult human rights issues, and to include as well the language of the legal instruments with which those courts must work, it cannot include many cases. And, while this means that coverage cannot be

very great, that is inevitable anyway if human rights issues from a number of countries are to be addressed in a work of approximately 200 pages. (This is clear if one considers how long a casebook would have to be to comprehensively address all matters relevant only to the Bill of Rights and Reconstruction Amendments in the United States Constitution.) When all of these factors are taken into account, what has resulted is this casebook. It is hoped that this reasoning makes sense.

## Usage Conventions

To permit readers to avoid having to adjust to different arrangements of material in different cases, it seemed helpful to make some rules of usage. They are:

First, where the original documents reproduced here employed British rather than American spelling, the spelling has *not* been altered.

Second, bracketed material has been inserted by the editor, generally to summarize important but lengthy portions of a document, occasionally to add explanatory material too important to be left to footnotes.

Third, regarding footnotes, please note that most of those in the documents reproduced in this work have been omitted. Those footnotes which have been retained are numbered consecutively in each document, without regard to their original numbering. Footnotes by the editor are indicated by lower case letters.

Fourth, please note that case naming conventions and citation formats necessarily vary from jurisdiction to jurisdiction. Japanese cases are, when possible, named according to the label attached to them on the website of the Supreme Court of Japan, and are cited by case number, date of decision and reporter in which they appeared (except when the website does not name that reporter). Cases not taken from the Supreme Court's website are named and cited as they were in the source from which they were taken. Cases from the European Court of Human Rights are cited to the official reports of that court; earlier decisions are therefore cited by their number within Series A of that court's publications and by date of decisions; later cases, appearing in the volumes entitled *European Human Rights Cases*, are cited to those volumes, which are abbreviated E.C.H.R. Cases from the Supreme Court of India are, when possible, cited to the Supreme Court Reports, abbreviated S.C.R., and to the Supreme Court sections of the All-India Reporter, abbreviated A.I.R.(S.C.). Occasionally, however, Indian citations are to the All-India Reporter Supreme Court Weekly, abbreviated A.I.R.(S.C.W.), or the Supreme Court Journal, abbreviated S.C.J. There is



also one citation to the Federal Court Reports, abbreviated F.C.R., reporting decisions of the highest court of pre-independence India.

It was necessary to decide how to deal with the texts of legal instruments discussed in the book. The basic approach taken was to reproduce only the sections/articles of the various Constitutions/statutes/treaties relevant to the cases decided, instead of attempting to present the entirety of each instrument; where cases refer to an entire instrument but not to any of its component sections/articles, e.g. "The ABC Statute of 2006" instead of "Section 28 of the ABC Statute of 2006," nothing is reproduced. Where a case cites a section/article itself having little to do with human rights and the thrust of which is clear from the discussion, that section/article is not reproduced; such sections/articles are marked with an asterisk(\*) the first time they are cited in each case or other discussion, but not especially designated otherwise. Finally, where a section or article is not reproduced in the appendix, but is quoted verbatim in the case or other discussion which refers to it, that section or article is marked with two asterisks (\*\*) the first time it appears, and not otherwise marked. All other sections/articles mentioned in the discussions which follow appear in the Appendix.

## Translations

The translators of Japanese cases taken from the website of the Japanese Supreme Court are indicated to the extent that information is provided on the website. The translators of Japanese cases taken from copyrighted works are indicated to the extent that information is provided in those works. Some of the separate opinions from European Court of Human Rights decisions are described on that court's website as translations, but that website does not provide the name of the translator; since the translations appear on that website, however, they are presumably official.



# Acknowledgments

---

The Editor wishes to acknowledge, with gratitude:

Cavendish Publishing Limited, for permission to reprint material from Meryll Dean, *Japanese Legal System*, Second Edition, 2002.

The University of Washington Press, for permission to reprint material from John M. Maki, *Court and Constitution in Japan: Selected Supreme Court Decisions, 1948–1960*, with translations by Ikeda Masaaki, David C.S. Sissons, and Kurt Steiner, 1964.

The University of North Carolina Law Foundation, for its support of this project.