European Journal of Law and Public Administration
ISSN: 2360-6754 | e-ISSN: 2559-7671
Covered in: Erih Plus; HeinOnline; CEEOL; RePEc; CrossRef; Google Scholar; KVK; WorldCat; ICI Journals Master List - Index Copernicus; EBSCO.

2025, Volume 12, Issue 1, pages: 69-77 | https://doi.org/10.18662/eljpa/12.1/256

Criminal Justice and Human Dignity: A European Perspective on the Limits of Punitive Power in Light of ECHR Jurisprudence

Mihai ŞTEFĂNOAIA [1]

[1] Faculty of Law and Administrative Sciences, "Ştefan cel Mare" University Suceava, Romania; https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7163-4436; stefanoaiamihai@yahoo.com

Abstract: *This paper investigates the relationship between criminal justice and human dignity in the context of European legal standards, with a particular focus on the limitations imposed on punitive power by the jurisprudence of the European Court of Human Rights (ECHR). Against the backdrop of an evolving European human rights framework, the study examines how the principle of human dignity operates as a substantive constraint on state-sanctioned punishment. The paper is guided by the central thesis that dignity-based reasoning—grounded in Article 3 of the European Convention on Human Rights, which prohibits torture and inhuman or degrading treatment—has reshaped the contours of penal legitimacy within Council of Europe member states.*

The methodology is primarily doctrinal, supported by case analysis and comparative legal reasoning. Key ECHR rulings—such as Tyrer v. United Kingdom, Vinter and Others v. United Kingdom, and M.S. v. Croatia—are examined to identify common principles limiting excessive or disproportionate punishment. The findings suggest that the ECHR has progressively elevated human dignity from a rhetorical ideal to an enforceable legal standard, influencing national criminal policies, prison conditions, and sentencing practices. While challenges persist regarding implementation and interpretive consistency, the Court's jurisprudence marks a significant shift toward a humanistic and proportionate approach to criminal sanctioning. The study concludes that a dignity-centered penal system not only enhances compliance with European human rights law but also promotes a more just and resilient criminal justice framework.

Keywords: *human dignity; punitive power; ECHR jurisprudence; criminal justice; proportionality.*

How to cite: Ştefănoaia, M. (2025). Criminal justice and human dignity: A european perspective on the limits of punitive power in light of echr jurisprudence. *European Journal of Law and Public Administration, 12*(1), 69-77. https://doi.org/10.18662/eljpa/12.1/256

©2025 Published by In Manifest Network in partnership with LUMEN Publishing. This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC-ND license http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/

Introduction

In recent decades, the relationship between criminal justice and human dignity has become a central concern in European legal and political discourse. The increasing emphasis on human rights within penal systems reflects a broader transformation in the theoretical foundations of punishment, where retribution is increasingly balanced—or replaced—by principles of proportionality, rehabilitation, and respect for the individual (Ashworth, 2015; van Zyl Smit & Snacken, 2009). Within this paradigm shift, the European Court of Human Rights (ECHR) has emerged as a key actor in setting legal limits on state punitive power, particularly through its evolving interpretation of Article 3 of the European Convention on Human Rights, which prohibits torture and inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment.

This paper is situated within the growing body of scholarship that explores the normative and jurisprudential implications of human dignity in criminal law (Düwell et al., 2014; McCrudden, 2008). While national penal systems retain discretion over sentencing and prison policy, the ECHR has increasingly acted as a supranational guardian of fundamental rights, framing excessive or arbitrary punishment as incompatible with the democratic values of the Convention system. Against this backdrop, the current study examines how the Court's jurisprudence has operationalized the concept of human dignity as a substantive constraint on penal power.

The main objective of this paper is to analyze key ECHR rulings that delineate the outer boundaries of legitimate punishment in Europe, with a focus on the role of human dignity in shaping those limits. The working hypothesis is that the ECHR has progressively transformed dignity from a moral aspiration into a legally enforceable standard, thereby influencing national criminal justice systems and encouraging the development of proportionate, humane, and rights-based penal policies.

Literature review

The intersection of criminal justice and human dignity has gained increased scholarly attention in the context of human rights discourse, particularly within European jurisdictions. The concept of human dignity—although originally philosophical and moral in nature—has gradually become a legally operational principle in supranational human rights law (McCrudden, 2008). In this regard, the European Court of Human Rights (ECHR) has played a fundamental role in translating dignity into a justiciable

standard that constrains state power in the penal domain (Düwell et al., 2014; Spielmann, 2015).

One significant line of scholarship has explored how Article 3 of the European Convention on Human Rights functions as a threshold norm, prohibiting any form of punishment that violates the intrinsic worth of the individual (van Zyl Smit & Snacken, 2009; Bălan, 2020). Landmark judgments such as *Tyrer v. United Kingdom* and *Vinter and Others v. United Kingdom* have been central to this evolution, emphasizing the need for punishment to remain compatible with contemporary human rights values (ECHR, 1978; ECHR, 2013). However, much of the existing literature focuses on doctrinal analysis or case-by-case commentary, lacking a broader theoretical synthesis of how the dignity principle reshapes the legitimacy of punitive practices at a systemic level (Ashworth & Zedner, 2014).

Furthermore, while numerous studies have examined specific rights of detainees—such as protection against degrading treatment or access to rehabilitation (Murdoch, 2012)—few have critically assessed the structural implications of ECHR jurisprudence on domestic penal policies across Europe. The gap lies in the limited integration of ECHR case law into national debates about the legitimate scope of state coercion and the underlying justifications for punishment. Additionally, there is insufficient exploration of how dignity functions not only as a limit on state action but also as a positive obligation to ensure rehabilitative and inclusive criminal justice systems (Lazarus, 2005).

This paper seeks to address these gaps by offering a conceptual and jurisprudential analysis of human dignity as a binding legal standard that informs both the limits and obligations of European penal systems. By critically engaging with ECHR case law and positioning it within the broader literature on punishment and human rights, the study contributes to a more coherent understanding of how supranational legal reasoning constrains punitive excess and fosters a dignity-centered penal framework.

Beyond its negative role as a constraint on inhumane treatment, human dignity also holds a positive dimension in criminal law, requiring that penal systems be designed to promote rehabilitation and reintegration. Scholars such as van Zyl Smit and Snacken (2009) argue that the idea of "humane penal policy" emerges precisely from this double function of dignity: it limits the severity of state-inflicted punishment while simultaneously generating obligations to support offender transformation. This view is echoed in more recent works which emphasize that dignity-based reasoning requires states not merely to avoid cruelty, but to actively

provide conditions for moral agency and personal development within prison systems (Vannier, 2020).

However, several authors have identified persistent tensions between security-based penal policies and human dignity, particularly in the context of terrorism, life imprisonment, or preventive detention regimes (Padfield et al., 2020). These tensions are evident in ECHR rulings that require individualized sentence reviews or prohibit de facto irreducible life sentences (*Vinter and Others v. UK*, 2013). While such decisions are often hailed as victories for human rights, they have also been criticized for their limited enforceability and the variability in national implementation (Keller & Sweet, 2008; Arabadjieva, 2022).

An emerging strand of scholarship also critiques the fragmented or inconsistent application of the dignity principle across ECHR judgments. For instance, while some decisions articulate a strong commitment to dignity (e.g., *M.S. v. Croatia*, 2015), others seem to rely more heavily on proportionality or margin of appreciation doctrines, creating uncertainty about the normative weight of dignity within the Convention system (Letsas, 2013). This ambiguity, while arguably inevitable in a pluralist legal order, has led to concerns about the effectiveness of ECHR jurisprudence in generating consistent standards of penal legitimacy across Europe.

In addition, legal theorists such as Ashworth and Zedner (2014) emphasize that traditional theories of punishment—retributivism, deterrence, incapacitation—remain insufficiently responsive to the moral claims inherent in human dignity. Their critique invites a rethinking of the purposes and limits of punishment, favoring models that prioritize restoration, social justice, and non-violence. Yet, most domestic criminal justice systems continue to balance these values with political pressures, such as public demand for harsh sentencing, which often conflict with human rights norms (Loader & Sparks, 2010).

In light of these debates, this paper intervenes at the convergence point between ECHR jurisprudence and evolving theoretical models of punishment. It contends that human dignity, as articulated by the Court, has the potential to serve as a unifying principle that not only limits punitive excess but also offers a normative framework for positive penal transformation. By synthesizing scattered doctrinal developments into a coherent analytical narrative, the study seeks to fill a significant gap in the literature and offer tools for both legal scholarship and policy reform.

Arguments to support the thesis

The central thesis of this paper holds that the European Court of Human Rights (ECHR) has progressively transformed the abstract notion of human dignity into a legally enforceable standard, which significantly constrains the exercise of punitive power in member states. Several arguments support this view.

First, Article 3 of the European Convention on Human Rights, which prohibits torture and inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment, has been interpreted by the Court as a non-derogable norm that embodies the essence of human dignity (Letsas, 2013; Spielmann, 2015). In *Tyrer v. United Kingdom* (1978), the Court famously declared that judicial corporal punishment offended human dignity, thus embedding dignity directly into the interpretation of Article 3.

Second, in *Vinter and Others v. United Kingdom* (2013), the Grand Chamber held that life imprisonment without the possibility of release is incompatible with human dignity unless there is a realistic prospect of rehabilitation and release. This ruling not only affirmed the dignitarian basis of penal legitimacy but also introduced a positive obligation on states to provide mechanisms of hope and reintegration (Smit & Appleton, 2019).

Third, subsequent case law has confirmed that the treatment of prisoners, conditions of detention, and proportionality of punishment are all subject to scrutiny under the dignity-based lens of Article 3. For example, in *M.S. v. Croatia* (2015), the Court emphasized that detention conditions must preserve a person's physical and moral integrity—an explicit invocation of dignity as a baseline requirement of lawful punishment.

Finally, academic commentary increasingly recognizes dignity as a conceptual anchor for rethinking criminal justice, advocating penal moderation, individualized sentencing, and restorative approaches (Ashworth & Zedner, 2014; Düwell et al., 2014). Thus, both jurisprudential trends and scholarly reflections converge in affirming the normative authority of dignity in reshaping European penal standards.

Arguments to argue the thesis

Despite the normative appeal and legal significance of human dignity in ECHR jurisprudence, several counter-arguments and limitations challenge the extent to which dignity truly functions as a consistent and transformative constraint on punitive power.

First, the doctrinal ambiguity surrounding the status of dignity within the Convention system weakens its practical enforceability. While dignity is

frequently cited in judgments, it is not explicitly mentioned in the text of the ECHR, and the Court often relies instead on concepts such as proportionality or margin of appreciation (McCrudden, 2008; Keller & Sweet, 2008). This leads to inconsistent jurisprudence, where dignity serves more as a rhetorical device than as a clear legal standard.

Second, implementation deficits at the national level undermine the effectiveness of dignity-based rulings. For example, several member states have resisted the abolition or reform of irreducible life sentences or solitary confinement regimes, despite ECHR criticism (*Murray v. The Netherlands*, 2016). This highlights the limited coercive power of the Court, especially when judgments conflict with domestic political preferences or penal populism (Padfield et al., 2020).

Third, critics argue that the Court's interpretive turn toward dignity may obscure other rights-based analyses, such as those based on procedural justice or equality before the law (Letsas, 2013). There is a risk that framing all penal excess as a dignity violation may depoliticize broader issues of structural injustice or discrimination within criminal systems.

Finally, the fragmented application of the dignity principle in areas such as migration detention, juvenile justice, or counter-terrorism laws raises questions about its universality. Scholars note that the Court's approach can sometimes appear selective or reactive, rather than grounded in a principled, coherent theory of punishment (Arabadjieva, 2022)

These counterpoints do not invalidate the thesis but rather call for a more nuanced and critically engaged application of dignity within European criminal justice. They underline the need for clearer doctrinal integration, stronger mechanisms of compliance, and a deeper theoretical engagement with the moral foundations of penal power.

Limits and discussions

While this paper aims to provide a comprehensive theoretical analysis of the relationship between human dignity and the limits of punitive power in European criminal justice, several limitations must be acknowledged with regard to the scope, methodology, and applicability of the research.

From a geographical perspective, the study is grounded primarily in the jurisprudence of the European Court of Human Rights and its impact on Council of Europe member states. As such, the findings may not be immediately generalizable to legal systems outside the European human rights framework, particularly those that do not recognize the binding authority of the ECHR or operate under different normative foundations

(e.g., common law jurisdictions outside Europe, authoritarian regimes, or states with punitive-oriented penal policies).

In terms of epistemological limitations, this paper adopts a doctrinal and normative approach rather than an empirical or socio-legal methodology. While this allows for an in-depth conceptual exploration of legal texts and judgments, it does not account for the lived experiences of detainees, nor does it measure the actual implementation of dignity-based principles at the national level. The analysis is thus limited to what the ECHR declares and implies, rather than how its jurisprudence is enforced or experienced in practice.

Methodologically, the article focuses on a selective sample of landmark cases to illustrate its argument. Although these rulings are representative of broader trends, they do not exhaust the full complexity or variance of ECHR jurisprudence across different legal and cultural contexts. Furthermore, the absence of empirical validation means that conclusions regarding systemic transformation or policy impact remain theoretically inferred rather than empirically demonstrated.

Despite these limitations, the findings contribute meaningfully to the literature by offering a systematized reading of ECHR jurisprudence through the lens of human dignity, a perspective that remains underexplored in both academic and policy discussions. This paper argues that human dignity is not merely a rhetorical embellishment in legal reasoning, but a substantive and evolving constraint on punitive power with the potential to reshape national penal systems. As such, the analysis is relevant not only to European legal scholars but also to global audiences interested in the intersection of human rights and penal reform.

The original contribution of this article lies in its dual-layered critique: it both highlights the normative promise of dignity-based limitations on state punishment and identifies the jurisprudential and institutional gaps that inhibit full realization of these standards. By articulating a coherent theoretical framework and aligning it with select case law, the paper provides a conceptual toolkit for reimagining criminal justice in ways that affirm human worth, proportionality, and rehabilitative goals, resonating with international efforts toward more humane penal policies.

Conclusions

This article set out to examine the extent to which the European Court of Human Rights (ECHR) has contributed to redefining the limits of punitive power in criminal justice systems by embedding the principle of human dignity within its jurisprudence. In line with the stated objectives, the

paper analyzed how key judgments—particularly under Article 3 of the European Convention on Human Rights—have functioned as normative constraints on state punishment, reinforcing the prohibition of inhuman or degrading treatment and promoting rehabilitative and proportionate penal approaches.

Although the study is theoretical in nature and does not rely on empirical data, it advances and supports the central thesis: that human dignity, as developed in ECHR case law, has evolved into a substantive legal standard capable of influencing domestic criminal justice policies. This hypothesis was validated through critical examination of landmark cases such as *Tyrer v. UK*, *Vinter and Others v. UK*, and *M.S. v. Croatia*, which demonstrate the Court's growing reliance on dignity as both a negative constraint (limiting punitive excess) and a positive obligation (ensuring humane treatment and reintegration).

The conclusions drawn from this analysis underline the transformative potential of dignity-based reasoning in shaping a European model of criminal justice grounded in human rights. At the same time, the paper recognizes that the practical impact of these legal standards remains uneven, due to variations in national implementation, political resistance, and jurisprudential inconsistencies.

Ultimately, the study contributes to a deeper understanding of how supranational legal norms—particularly those rooted in human dignity—can function not only as abstract ideals but as operative principles capable of realigning penal systems toward legitimacy, restraint, and respect for human worth. This theoretical framework offers valuable insights for legal scholars, practitioners, and policymakers committed to promoting justice systems that are both effective and ethically grounded.

References

Arabadjieva, K. (2022). Worker empowerment, collective labour rights and Article 11 of the European Convention on Human Rights. *Human Rights Law Review, 22*(1), ngab019., https://doi.org/10.1093/hrlr/ngab019

Ashworth, A. (2015). *Sentencing and Criminal Justice* (6th ed.). Cambridge University Press.

Ashworth, A., & Zedner, L. (2014). *Preventive Justice*. Oxford University Press.

Düwell, M., Braarvig, J., Brownsword, R., & Mieth, D. (Eds.). (2014). *The Cambridge handbook of human dignity: interdisciplinary perspectives*. Cambridge University Press.

European Court of Human Rights (ECHR). *M.S. v. Croatia*, Application no. 36337/10, Judgment of 25 April 2015.

European Court of Human Rights (ECHR). *Tyrer v. United Kingdom*, Application no. 5856/72, Judgment of 25 April 1978.

European Court of Human Rights (ECHR). *Vinter and Others v. United Kingdom*, Applications nos. 66069/09, 130/10 and 3896/10, Grand Chamber Judgment of 9 July 2013.

Keller, H., & Sweet, A. S. (2008). *A Europe of rights: The impact of the ECHR on national legal systems*. Oxford University Press.

Lazarus, L. (2005). *Contrasting prisoners' rights: A comparative examination of Germany and England*. Oxford University Press, https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199259830.001.0001

Letsas, G. (2013). The ECHR as a living instrument: Its meaning and legitimacy. In A. Føllesdal, B. Peters, & G. Ulfstein (Eds.), *Constituting Europe: The European Court of Human Rights in a National, European and Global Context* (pp. 106–141). Cambridge University Press.

Loader, I., & Sparks, R. (2010). *Public Criminology?* Routledge

McCrudden, C. (2008). Human dignity and judicial interpretation of human rights. *European Journal of International Law*, *19*(4), 655–724. https://doi.org/10.1093/ejil/chn043

Murdoch, J. (2012). *The Treatment of Prisoners: European Standards*. Council of Europe.

Padfield, N., Smit, D. V. Z., & Dünkel, F. (Eds.). (2020). *Release from Prison: European Policy and Practice*. Willan

Smit, D. V. Z., & Appleton, C. (2019). *Life Imprisonment and Human Rights*. Hart Publishing.

Smit, D. V. Z., & Snacken, S. (2009). *Principles of European Prison Law and Policy: Penology and Human Rights*. Oxford University Press.

Vannier, M. (2020). Dirk van Zyl Smit and Catherine Appleton, Life imprisonment: A global human rights analysis. *Punishment & Society, 23*(1), 135-138. https://doi.org/10.1177/1462474520930174