



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

FOURTH SECTION

CASE OF GOODWIN v. THE UNITED KINGDOM

(Application no. 65723/01)

JUDGMENT

STRASBOURG

22 January 2008

FINAL

22/04/2008

This judgment will become final in the circumstances set out in Article 44 § 2 of the Convention. It may be subject to editorial revision.

In the case of Goodwin v. the United Kingdom,

The European Court of Human Rights (Fourth Section), sitting as a Chamber composed of:

Josep Casadevall, *President*,

Nicolas Bratza,

Giovanni Bonello,

Kristaq Traja,

Stanislav Pavlovski,

Ján Šikuta,

Päivi Hirvelä, *judges*,

and Lawrence Early, *Section Registrar*,

Having deliberated in private on 4 January 2008,

Delivers the following judgment, which was adopted on that date:

PROCEDURE

1. The case originated in an application (no. 65723/01) against the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland lodged with the Court under Article 34 of the Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms (“the Convention”) by Mr John Goodwin (“the applicant”) on 12 December 2000.

2. The applicant was unrepresented. The United Kingdom Government (“the Government”) were represented by their Agent, Mr C. Whomersley of the Foreign and Commonwealth Office, London.

3. The applicant complained that the United Kingdom authorities’ refusal to grant him Widow’s Bereavement Allowance or equivalent constituted discrimination on grounds of sex contrary to Article 14 of the Convention in conjunction with Article 1 of Protocol No. 1.

4. By a partial decision of 4 December 2001 the Court decided to communicate this application. It also decided to join this application to other applications (nos. 60525/00, 60933/00, 60937/00, 60944/00, 61038/00, 61388/00, 61949/00, 62776/00 63388/00, 63464/00, 63469/00, 63470/00, 63473/00, 63474/00, 63584/00, 63645/00, 63701/00, 63702/00 and 64735/01).

5. On 26 August 2003, after obtaining the parties’ observations, the Court declared the application admissible in so far as the complaint concerned Widow’s Bereavement Allowance and declared the remainder of the application inadmissible.

THE FACTS

I. THE CIRCUMSTANCES OF THE CASE

6. The applicant was born in 1943 and lives in Solihull.

7. His wife died on 23 March 1999. On 16 September 2000 the applicant made a claim to the Inland Revenue requesting an allowance equivalent to that received by a widow, namely Widow's Bereavement Allowance ("WBA"), for the years 1998/99 and 1999/2000. On 29 September 2000 the Inland Revenue informed him that he was ineligible for WBA as he was not a woman. The applicant did not appeal further as he considered or was advised that such a remedy would be bound to fail since no such benefit was payable to widowers under United Kingdom law.

II. RELEVANT DOMESTIC LAW

8. The relevant domestic law and practice are described in the Court's judgment in the case of *Hobbs, Richard, Walsh and Geen v. the United Kingdom*, nos. 63684/00, 63475/00, 63484/00 and 63468/00, judgment of 26 March 2007.

THE LAW

I. ALLEGED VIOLATION OF ARTICLE 14 OF THE CONVENTION TAKEN IN CONJUNCTION WITH ARTICLE 1 OF PROTOCOL NO. 1

9. The applicant complained that the United Kingdom authorities' refusal to grant him WBA or equivalent constituted discrimination on grounds of sex contrary to Article 14 of the Convention taken in conjunction with Article 1 of Protocol No. 1.

Article 14 of the Convention provides:

"The enjoyment of the rights and freedoms set forth in this Convention shall be secured without discrimination on any ground such as sex, race, colour, language, religion, political or other opinion, national or social origin, association with a national minority, property, birth or other status."

Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 provides:

"1. Every natural or legal person is entitled to the peaceful enjoyment of his possessions. No one shall be deprived of his possessions except in the public interest

and subject to the conditions provided for by law and by the general principles of international law.

2. The preceding provisions shall not, however, in any way impair the right of a State to enforce such laws as it deems necessary to control the use of property in accordance with the general interest or to secure the payment of taxes or other contributions or penalties.”

10. The Court has previously examined cases raising issues similar to those in the present case and found a violation of Article 14 of the Convention taken in conjunction with Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 (*Hobbs, Richard, Walsh and Geen v. the United Kingdom*, nos. 63684/00, 63475/00, 63484/00 and 63468/00, judgment of 26 March 2007, §§ 53-54).

11. The Court has examined the present case and finds that there are no facts or arguments from the Government which would lead to any different conclusion in this instance. Therefore the Court considers that the difference in treatment between men and women as regards entitlement to WBA, of which the applicant was a victim, was not based on any “objective and reasonable justification” (see *Hobbs*, cited above, § 53).

12. There has accordingly been a violation of Article 14 of the Convention taken in conjunction with Article 1 of Protocol No. 1.

II. APPLICATION OF ARTICLE 41 OF THE CONVENTION

13. 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.”

A. Damage

14. The applicant claimed 482 pounds sterling (GBP) for WBA, plus tax, in respect of pecuniary damage.

15. The Government argued that such an award could not be made, having regard to the Court’s case-law in this area.

16. In its lead judgment regarding WBA the Court found no reason to remedy the inequality of treatment by “levelling up” and awarding the value of tax benefits which had been found to be unjustified. It accordingly made no award in respect of the pecuniary loss alleged to have been suffered (see *Hobbs, Richard, Walsh and Geen v. United Kingdom*, nos. 63684/00, 63475/00, 63484/00 and 63468/00, 26 March 2007, § 69).

17. The Court finds no reason to depart from this finding and consequently no award can be made under this head.

B. Costs and expenses

18. The applicant made no claim under this head.

FOR THESE REASONS, THE COURT UNANIMOUSLY

1. *Decides* to disjoin the application from the others to which it was joined;
2. *Holds* that there has been a violation of Article 14 of the Convention taken in conjunction with Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 concerning the applicant's non-entitlement to a Widow's Bereavement Allowance;
3. *Dismisses* the applicant's claim for just satisfaction.

Done in English, and notified in writing on 22 January 2008, pursuant to Rule 77 §§ 2 and 3 of the Rules of Court.

Lawrence Early
Registrar

Josep Casadevall
President