Review

DAWN OLIVER
THE HUMAN RIGHTS ACT
AND PUBLIC LAW/PRIVATE LAW DIVIDES

**BILL BOWRING** 

RUSSIA'S ACCESSION TO THE COUNCIL OF EUROPE AND HUMAN RIGHTS: FOUR YEARS ON

STEPHEN TIERNEY
DEVOLUTION ISSUES
AND s.2(1) OF THE HUMAN RIGHTS ACT 1998

STEVE FOSTER DO PRISONERS HAVE THE RIGHT TO FREE SPEECH?

Is see 4 2000

## EUROPEAN HUMAN RIGHTS

## w Review

Issue 4 2000

pages 343-438

EHRLR aims to promote better understanding of European human rights law, and to provide a forum for serious debate on the European Convention on Human Rights. Tailored to the needs of the practitioner and academic lawyers, it carries articles on all aspects of human rights law as well as providing authoritative commentaries on current developments in this field.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

| The Human Rights Act and Public Law/Private Law Divides  Dawn Oliver                    | 343 |
|---|-----|
| Bulletin  | 356 |
| Russia's Accession to the Coucil of Europe and Human Rights: Four Years On Bill Bowring | 362 |
| Devolution Issues and s.2(1) of the Human Rights Act 1998 Stephen Tierney               | 380 |
| Do Prisoners Have the Right to Free Speech?  Steve Foster                               | 393 |

| CASES AND COMMENT  |             |
|--|-------------|
| ITC (Isle of Man), P.S.W.H. and A.G.S. v. United Kingdom | 411         |
| Caballero v. United Kingdom                              |             |
| Jordan v. United Kingdom                                 | 415         |
| Raphael Rowe and Michael Davis v. United Kingdom         | 417         |
| Eric Jasper v. United Kingdom                            |             |
| Barry Fitt v. United Kingdom                             | 417         |
| Fuentes Bobo v. Spain                                    | <b>42</b> 1 |
| McGonnell v. United Kingdom                              | <b>42</b> 3 |
| Scott v. United Kingdom                                  | 425         |
| Said Mohammed Hilal v. United Kingdom                    |             |
| T.I. v. United Kingdom                                   | <b>42</b> 9 |
| Andreas Wabl v. Austria                                  |             |
| Amann v. Switzerland                                     | <b>43</b> 3 |
| Curley v. United Kingdom                                 | 434         |
|  |             |

This Review may be cited as: [2000] E.H.R.L.R.

© Sweet and Maxwell Limited, 100 Avenue Road, NW3 3PF (http://www.sweetandmaxwell.co.uk) and contributors 2000

All rights reserved. Crown copyright legislation is reproduced under the terms of Crown Copyright Policy Guidance issued by HMSO.

No part of this publication may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means, or stored in any retrieval system of any nature without prior written permission, except for permitted fair dealing under the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988, or in accordance with the terms of a licence issued by the Copyright Licensing Agency in respect of photocopying and/or reprographic reproduction.

Application for permission for other use of copyright material including permission to reproduce extracts in other published works shall be made to the publishers. Full acknowledgment of author, publisher and source must be given.

ISSN: 1361-1526