

Q&A — Human Rights & Public Law

Version 1.0.0 · 2026-10-23

Editors of the Great House Farm Legal Wiki

Table of Contents

1	Release notes	1
1.1	This release (version 1.0.0).	1
1.2	Older versions	1
2	Record	1
2.1	Q&A — Human Rights & Public Law	1

Page 519 of the Great House Farm Legal Wiki, carried over from the version last modified on 2026-10-21. The same page is published at research.bucklerfamily.estate, and this version is also a [PDF](#) in the wayback archive.

1 Release notes

1.1 This release (version 1.0.0)

- **2026-Oct-23** - Carried over to the docs library from Legal Wiki page 519 (last modified 2026-10-21 19:10:36 UTC). The page text, dates and references are as on the wiki. Links to wiki pages lead to the same page on research.bucklerfamily.estate; images are links to their files on the wiki.

1.2 Older versions

None yet.

2 Record

Page ID: 519 · **Title:** Q&A — Human Rights & Public Law · **Evidence status:** Not yet labelled — see the Editing Protocol · **Version:** 1.0.0 · [Editing Protocol](#)

2.1 Q&A — Human Rights & Public Law

Was there a European human-rights case?

The research record identifies **ECHR application 14464/88**, introduced on 3 May 1988, registered on 12 December 1988 and declared inadmissible on 14 April 1989. The fact of the application and its outcome are historical records; the legal reasons and implications need to be read from the actual Strasbourg materials.

What happened to the original Commission case file?

ARCHIVE CORRESPONDENCE. The European Court of Human Rights Archives has confirmed to the family that the case file for application **14464/88** was destroyed in **2000**. The 14 April 1989 Commission decision remains available through HUDOC. The Wiki therefore does not state that the destroyed 1989 case file can still be ordered.

Which Convention rights might a lawyer examine?

Why could Article 6 be relevant?

The dispute included litigation and possession proceedings. Article 6 concerns fair hearing and related procedural protections. Whether it has any application to a particular historical event would depend on the proceedings, dates, standing and admissibility rules.

Why could Article 8 be relevant?

Article 8 protects private and family life and the home, subject to its legal framework. The family describes [Great House Farm](#) as the family home and records the 1988 eviction. Any legal assessment would require the contemporaneous facts and the relevant authorities.

Why could Protocol 1 Article 1 be relevant?

Does the human-rights dimension prove an unlawful act?

What public-law questions arise from records handling?

2.1.1 Open human-rights and public-law questions

- What were the exact grounds on which ECHR application 14464/88 was declared inadmissible?
- What rights and remedies were argued in the domestic and Strasbourg proceedings?
- Does any present-day public-law mechanism provide a route to revisit an historic record or decision?
- What evidence exists about the original administrative decision-making surrounding heritage and demolition?
- Which current complaints, information-rights or archival mechanisms remain available?

2.1.2 Page version & change log

Current version: 1.0.0

Version	Date (UTC)	Editor (human or agent name)	Change	Source / evidence
1.0.0	2026-10-18T15:17Z	Sion’s Tab agent	Footer standardised; no content change	Editing Protocol, 18 Oct 2026

Agents and editors: follow the [Editing Protocol](#).