



Hungarian Helsinki Committee

HUNGARIAN HELSINKI COMMITTEE

H-1074 Budapest, Dohány utca 20. II/9.

P.O. Box: H-1242 Budapest, Pf. 317.

Tel/fax: + 36 1 321 4323, 321 4141, 321 4327

helsinki@helsinki.hu

www.helsinki.hu

The Office of the Commissioner for Fundamental Rights

R70 Office Building

1074 Budapest, Rákóczi út 70-72.

Budapest, 14 September 2020

Dear Mr. Kozma,

I, the undersigned, András Kádár, co-chair of the Hungarian Helsinki Committee, under point e) of Article 24(2) of the Fundamental Law and Sections 2(3) and 34 of Act CXI of 2011 on the Commissioner for Fundamental Rights (hereinafter: 'Ombudsperson Act'), and Section 24(2) of Act CLI of 2011 on the Constitutional Court, hereby request from you, Mr. Commissioner that you

request from the Constitutional Court to declare that point x) of Section 3, point be) of Section 69/B(1) and Section 69/B(3) of Act I of 2010 on Civil Registration Procedure (hereinafter: 'Act on Civil Registration') violate the Fundamental Law and to declare those provisions null and void, and

request to declare that the unavailability of a procedure for the legal recognition of the gender and name of transgender persons results in unconstitutionality by omission that shall be rectified by the law-maker.

Reasoning

1. The change of legislative environment

On 31 March 2020 (on the International Transgender Day of Visibility), the government introduced bill no. T/9934 to the National Assembly, and that bill was adopted by the National Assembly on 19 May 2020 (Act XXX of 2020 on the amendment of certain acts related to administration, and on endowment – hereinafter: 'Amending Act').

Under Section 33 of the Amending Act, a new point x) was introduced in Section 3 of the Act on Civil Registration as of 29 May 2020, which introduces the concept of 'sex at birth' and defines it as follows: *„the biological gender defined by the primary sexual characteristics and chromosomes.”*

Under point (b)(be) of Section 69/B(1) of the Act on Civil Registration, the register of personal identification data shall include the 'sex of the person at birth' after the entry into force of the Amending Act, while previously that provision required the 'sex of the person' to be registered.

The Amending Act amended Section 69/B (3) of the Act on Civil Registration in a way that the data under point (b) (be) of paragraph (1), ie. the sex at birth, cannot be changed. Before the entry into force of the Amending Act, paragraph (3) provided that no change in the personal identification data of a child may be registered in case that change would concern the data referring to the sex or, in relation to that, the data referring to the first name of the parents of that child. Point b) of Section 33(7) of the Amending Act repealed



Hungarian Helsinki Committee

HUNGARIAN HELSINKI COMMITTEE

H-1074 Budapest, Dohány utca 20. II/9.

P.O. Box: H-1242 Budapest, Pf. 317.

Tel/fax: + 36 1 321 4323, 321 4141, 321 4327

helsinki@helsinki.hu

www.helsinki.hu

Section 69/B(4) of the Act on Civil Registration which provided that the entering of a change of gender in the civil registry shall be refused if the marriage or registered partnership of the person concerned still exists.

Based on the above, therefore, the legislative modifications introduced by Section 33 of the Amending Act render the legal recognitions of gender and name practically impossible, that is, it precludes the possibility to request the change of the registered sex or, in relation that, the change of name in a registry procedure.

2. The effects of the legislative modifications on the transgender community

More than half of the 166 transgender persons participating in the 2015 general survey conducted by **Háttér Society** were the subject of discrimination due to the expression of their gender identity or due to their sexual orientation. In addition, more than a quarter of them became victims of violence, which most often included verbal harassment (93%) and threat of force (69%). The most frequent venue of both the discriminative and the violent cases were public spaces. According to the survey, the transgender victims of violent attacks suffered more serious injuries than not transgender LGB people. However, the latency of such crimes is very high: barely one tenth of those interviewed dared to ask for help, the reason of which is mostly that they do not trust the authorities and are afraid of the consequences of seeking justice.¹

In 2019, the **European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights (FRA)** conducted a survey into the situation of the LGBTQ community by interviewing 140000 persons of the group concerned. That report also highlights the mostly violent character of the attacks against LGBTQ persons and high latency. As opposed to the results of the 2015 survey by Háttér Society, according to the research conducted by FRA, only 5% of the victims in Hungary turned to the authorities for help.²

In light of the surveys referred to above, there is no doubt that transgender persons have been for a long time one of the most threatened social groups in Hungary, and their vulnerable situation has only been aggravated by Section 33 of the Amending Act (hereinafter: 'Section 33') and the related communication campaign by the governing party.³

According to the resolution of the **LGBTQ Division of the Hungarian Psychological Association (HPA)**, Section 33 *„lacks any neonatological and developmental psychological base, thus we deem it very dangerous that its aim is to undermine – only on ideological grounds, apparently, – the rights to human dignity and self-determination of a social group that is already extremely fragile and subject to exclusion.”* In the professional opinion of psychologists who also work with transgender people on a regular basis, *“by making the legal recognition of gender change impossible, transgender and intersex persons seeking gender reassignment are practically forced to live in constant discrimination. (...) All kinds of discrimination may have serious negative effects on the mental health and life of the individual or the given community, respectively. That is all the more true when rights that are essential to the happiness of our fellow human beings are revoked by the legislator.”*⁴

¹ Háttér Society: The social exclusion of transgender people in Hungary <https://www.ilga-europe.org/sites/default/files/Attachments/hatter-lmbtkut2010-transz.pdf>

² FRA – A long way to LGBTI equality https://fra.europa.eu/sites/default/files/fra_uploads/fra-2020-lgbti-equality-1_en.pdf

³ 444.hu – „It is totally irrelevant how the people concerned see this” – said the president of the committee from the KDNP party, when Bernadett Szél read out aloud the opinion of those protesting against the law prohibiting the change of gender <https://444.hu/2020/04/14/az-hogy-az-erintettek-hogy-latjak-teljesen-kozombos-mondta-a-kdnp-s-bizottsagi-elnok-amikor-szel-bernadett-a-nemvaltast-tilto-torveny-miatt-tiltakozok-velemenyet-olvasta-fel>

⁴ 24.hu – Secretary of State Rétvári compared the LGBTQ movement to Nazi and Communist dictatorship <https://24.hu/belfold/2020/08/26/retvari-naci-kommunista-diktatura-lmbtg/>

⁴ The resolution of the Division of LGBTQ Psychology of the Hungarian Psychological Association as regards the amendment of Act I of 2010 on Civil Registration Procedure <http://mpt.hu/wp-content/uploads/2020/04/Anyako%CC%88nyvi-tv-nyilatkozat.pdf>



Hungarian Helsinki Committee

HUNGARIAN HELSINKI COMMITTEE

H-1074 Budapest, Dohány utca 20. II/9.

P.O. Box: H-1242 Budapest, Pf. 317.

Tel/fax: + 36 1 321 4323, 321 4141, 321 4327

helsinki@helsinki.hu

www.helsinki.hu

The reports of Hungarian transgender persons portrayed by **CNN** fully support the conclusions of the LGBTQ Division of the HPA. As told by one of the transgender men featuring in the article, he attempted suicide four times before the age of 20 due to the insecurity characterizing his life and due to repression.⁵ And all that happened before the entry into force of Section 33.

The everyday reality experienced by transgender people will consist of a series of discrimination⁶ and "forced coming-outs"⁷ violating their dignity until they can get personal identification documents according to their real gender, and which accordingly reflect the related name.

Even according to the most conservative estimates, there are several thousands of transgender people living in Hungary today.⁸ Many of them, however, may be inclined to leave the country due to Section 33⁹, because they can no longer live here with dignity. Section 33 has serious and adverse effects on intersex people too, as it bars them from the possibility to have their sex and name corrected.

In the opinion of the **Hungarian Helsinki Committee**, based on the above, there can be no doubt that the Commissioner for Fundamental Rights should initiate an inquiry and request the Constitutional Court to annul Section 33 and to declare that the National Assembly should adopt an act on the legal recognition of the gender and name of transgender persons to rectify the omission resulting in the violation of the Fundamental Law. Beside the Hungarian Helsinki Committee, the same is requested by more than 105 000 persons whose petition has been submitted to you, Mr. Commissioner by **Amnesty International** and **Háttér Society**.¹⁰ In addition to non-governmental organizations and a group of people numbering the population of a major Hungarian city, the same is requested from you, Mr. Commissioner by the Commissioner for Human Rights of the Council of Europe, the International Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Trans and Intersex Association (ILGA) Europe, the European Parliament's LGBTI Intergroup, the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights, and Transgender Europe (TGEU).¹¹

Since transgender and intersex communities constitute a particularly vulnerable social group in Hungary at present, the obligation of protection as provided for in point d) of Section 1(2) of the Ombudsperson Act, too, clearly indicates that you, Mr. Commissioner, must take action to protect the Hungarian transgender and intersex communities. Both Hungarian and international law provide a great number of legal bases for that purpose.

3. The right to the recognition of sex and name as a fundamental right

You, Mr. Commissioner, wrote the following about Section 33 in your answer to the written question of a member of Parliament:

⁵ CNN – 'Living in fear' Hungary's new ban throws its transgender community into limbo

<https://edition.cnn.com/interactive/2020/06/world/hungary-transgender-portraits-cnnphotos/>

⁶ Háttér Society: Faces of exclusion <http://hatter.hu/sites/default/files/dokumentum/kiadvany/kirekesztesarcai.pdf>

⁷ Humen online – Ördög Ivett – „This dissonance, if untreated, may lead to serious mental problems” <https://humenonline.hu/ordog-ivett-ez-a-disszonancia-ha-nincs-kezelve-sulyos-lelki-problemakhoz-tud-vezetni/>

⁸ Népszava – They cannot decide on their sex https://nepszava.hu/3079860_nem-donthatnek-a-nemukrol

⁹ PinkNews – Under the cover of a deadly pandemic, Hungary's Viktor Orbán is legally erasing trans people. It's driving them to suicide <https://www.pinknews.co.uk/2020/04/24/hungary-viktor-orban-trans-law-transphobia-coronavirus-gender-sex-ivett-ordog-adel-onodi/>

¹⁰ Amnesty International – More than 100 thousand request Ákos Kozma, to do his job <https://www.amnesty.hu/mar-tobb-mint-100-ezren-kerik-kozma-akost-hogy-vegezze-a-munkajat/>

¹¹ Budapest Pride: The bill that renders the situation of transgender persons impossible has been adopted <https://budapestpride.hu/hirek/elfogadtak-a-transznemuket-ellehetetlenito-torvenyjavaslatot>



Hungarian Helsinki Committee

HUNGARIAN HELSINKI COMMITTEE

H-1074 Budapest, Dohány utca 20. II/9.

P.O. Box: H-1242 Budapest, Pf. 317.

Tel/fax: + 36 1 321 4323, 321 4141, 321 4327

helsinki@helsinki.hu

www.helsinki.hu

"In adopting my position as regards fundamental rights, I will rely on the decisions of the Constitutional Court and the case-law of the European Court of Human Rights (ECHR). The decisions of the Constitutional Court and the ECHR, however, were adopted following an assessment of certain particular questions, so I will adopt my final position based on an autonomous evaluation of the new regulations on civil registration introduced by the Amending Act from a fundamental rights perspective."¹²

The Commissioner for Fundamental Rights in his comprehensive report in case No. 883/2016, which discussed in detail the situation of transgender people in Hungary, pointed out that *„when exploring the context behind a given social problem, [the ombudsperson] fulfils his or her mandate conferred on him or her by the Fundamental Law only if he or she enumerates and compares the relevant arguments relating solely to fundamental rights, in an autonomous and an objective manner. In my view, the ombudsperson acts appropriately if he or she relies on the conclusions in principle of the Constitutional Court concerning the essential guarantees of the rule of law, the content of fundamental rights, and the tests of fundamental rights, in a coherent manner, and by accepting them as determining standards.”*

In our view, the following clearly indicate that both the Constitutional Court and the ECHR consider it **evident** that the legal recognition of gender and name are closely related **fundamental rights**. The interpretation of these bodies set out standards which are to be followed beyond the individual cases in which they have been stipulated. Based on the opinion of the Ombudsperson set out above, this interpretation is consistent with the practice of your office.

In case **B. v. France** (Application no. 13343/87, judgement of 25 March 1992), the ECHR declared a violation of Article 8 (right to respect for private life) of the of the European Convention of Human Rights (hereinafter: 'Convention') by the refusal of the legal recognition of gender of the applicant by the French authorities. It is to be highlighted that there are several similarities between the case of B. and the practice in Hungary before the entry into force of Section 33: a domestic case-law which is not uniform, but is mostly favorable concerning the need for the legal recognition of gender; the obligatory indication of (the registered) gender on the French personal identification documents, and that indication may contradict the gender in line with the real identity of the given person; and the dynamic character of the French registry system under which it is possible to modify registered data. The arguments of the State of France, too, are strikingly similar (judgement, § 50) to those sent by a member of the government to the members of the European Parliament¹³, according to which the refusal of the legal recognition of gender in itself does not concern the fundamental rights of the person, as one's identity may be freely enjoyed in everyday life even without legal recognition, and the person is not subject to any restriction by the State in that respect.

That judgement of the ECHR was also referred to by the **Constitutional Court** (CC) in its milestone **decision No. 58/2001 (XII.7.)** (hereinafter: 'decision on the right to names'):

„Nevertheless, according to the practice of the [European] Court [of Human Rights], in the case of transsexuals, the right to change their names may lead to allowing them to request the changing of their names as registered, and the registers must be changed accordingly because of the change of both their sex and names. Thus the State is bound to accept the changing of their sex – together with name changing. (Eur.Court HR, B.v. France, judgment of 25 March 1992, Series, A.no.232- C.)”

¹² The answer of the Commissioner for Fundamental Rights to a written question, no. K/10857 <https://www.parlament.hu/irom41/10857/10857-0001.pdf?fbclid=IwAR3Pa9qCTEX35jCvtj3L4q1v-ZULGpoZ2uOx8MAAtX7I2yifEVdzcT5DMi7c>

¹³ Letter of Gergely Gulyás addressed to the members of the European Parliament https://twitter.com/sandor_ronai/status/1255804819006279680?ref_src=twsrc%5Etfw%7Ctwcamp%5Etweetembed%7Ctwterm%5E1255804819006279680%7Ctwgr%5Eshare_3&ref_url=https%3A%2F%2Findex.hu%2Fkulfold%2Feurologus%2F2020%2F05%2F06%2Fgulyas_gergely_valasz_ep_ne_mvaltoztatás_transzneműek_salatatorveny%2F



Hungarian Helsinki Committee

HUNGARIAN HELSINKI COMMITTEE

H-1074 Budapest, Dohány utca 20. II/9.

P.O. Box: H-1242 Budapest, Pf. 317.

Tel/fax: + 36 1 321 4323, 321 4141, 321 4327

helsinki@helsinki.hu

www.helsinki.hu

In the decision on the right to names, the CC established in principle that *"[o]ne's own name is one of the – fundamental – determinants of personal identity, (...) it is one of the manifestations of one's individuality and unique character which cannot be substituted for. Therefore, the right to have one's own name is one of the fundamental elements of the right to self-identification, a fundamental right coming about with the birth of a child, which **may not be withdrawn by the State** and which is **unrestrictable** as far as its essential contents are concerned. (...) In fact, the above right is an inviolable and inalienable fundamental right of each person, and the State has the constitutional obligation to respect and protect it. (...) The essential contents of this fundamental right are its inviolability and inalienability, and such essential contents may not be restricted even by law. (...) Consequently, the right to have and bear one's own name is an unrestrictable fundamental right."*

In the view of the CC, the name is closely related to human dignity, as it is a manifestation of the innermost core of the human being, it has a central role in the forming and representation of external and internal identity. Similar to the right to human dignity, the right pertaining to a name that creates identity is unrestrictable in itself, however, some of its sub-categories – such as the changing of the name – are not. In this case, however, the constitutional test of the restriction of the fundamental right will be decisive. It is also important to point out that when assessing whether a given right is a fundamental one, the CC held that *"in the case of transsexuals changing their sex, the right to change one's name becomes a fundamental right."*

It was a little more than six months after the decision on the right to names that the Grand Chamber of the ECHR handed down its judgement in case ***Christine Goodwin v. United Kingdom*** (Application no. 28957/95, judgement of 11 July 2002) by which the Court – reversing its previous case-law – laid down the foundations of its now consistent case-law on the fundamental rights of transgender people. The Court found a violation of Article 8 of the Convention, i.e. the right to private life, with respect to the fact that the applicant could not receive a new National Insurance number after her gender reassignment surgery, and which enabled her employer to identify her as transgender. Moreover, the Court also established a violation of Article 12 of the Convention (right to marry), since the applicant could not marry her male partner, as British law treated her as male, although she lived as a woman (at that time same sex marriage was not yet legally allowed in the United Kingdom).

In the reasoning of its judgement the Court pointed it out that when assessing the legality of state measures interfering with the private life of individuals, states enjoy a wide margin of appreciation. The legal recognition of the name and gender of transgender persons may fall within that margin of appreciation, and in earlier British cases the Court had not found a breach of Article 8 with respect to the characteristics of the British civil registry system and the difficulties posed by any major change in the system. In the Goodwin case, however, the Court pointed it out that since the rights enshrined in the Convention must be practical and effective, in light of the social changes concerning the situation of transgender persons, and according to the concept of the "Convention as a living instrument", it is a **positive obligation** of the United Kingdom to accord legal recognition of the applicant's gender. The Court also acknowledged that the difficult position of transsexuals in the United Kingdom had already been pointed out by several domestic courts.

According to the consistent case-law of the Court on breaches of Article 8, the interests of the individual must be weighed against the general interest of the community when deciding whether a state measure interfering with the private life of an individual (or a failure of such measure) can be justified. In that respect the Court pointed it out that there are no significant factors of public interest that could justify the refusal of the legal recognition of the applicant's gender, thus the balance tilted decisively in favor of the applicant. Accordingly, the United Kingdom must accord the general legal recognition of gender. The problem, which pointed far beyond than the particular case, was remedied by the United Kingdom by the adoption of the Gender Recognition Act 2004.



Hungarian Helsinki Committee

HUNGARIAN HELSINKI COMMITTEE

H-1074 Budapest, Dohány utca 20. II/9.

P.O. Box: H-1242 Budapest, Pf. 317.

Tel/fax: + 36 1 321 4323, 321 4141, 321 4327

helsinki@helsinki.hu

www.helsinki.hu

The Court pointed out in connection with Article 12 that the very essence of the right to marry is impaired due to the fact that the applicant cannot marry her partner under British law. With respect to the fact that in case of transgender people legal recognition serves the very aim that the people concerned may live every aspect of life according to their real identity, it would not make sense to assume that biological criteria could be decisive in granting them the right to marry a person of the opposite gender. We would like to add: it necessarily follows from that, that where domestic law allows, the people concerned may marry persons of the same gender as their recognized gender (as it is the case in the United Kingdom since 2014). The case-law of the Court was recognized by the Hungarian Constitutional Court in its decision No. 154/2008. (XII.17.).

Following the Goodwin case, **the Court has consistently declared a breach of Article 8 for more than 18 years in cases when a state does not accord legal recognition of the gender and name of transgender persons in a practical and effective manner.** (See *Grant v. United Kingdom*, Application no. 32570/03; *Y.Y. v. Turkey*, Application no. 14793/08, *S.V. v. Italy*, Application no. 55216/08, *Y.T. v. Bulgaria*, Application no. 41701/16, *Rana v. Hungary*, Application no. 40888/17, *X. v. Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia*, Application no. 29683/16). According to its recent case-law, the Court found a breach of the Convention in cases where the legal recognition of name and gender are made subject to surgical intervention (*A.P., Garçon and Nicot v. France*, Applications no. 79885/1, 52471/1, and 52596/13).

As the Court held in *X. v. Macedonia*: "*while the essential object of Article 8 is to **protect individuals against arbitrary interference by public authorities**, it may **also impose on a State certain positive obligations** to ensure effective respect for the rights protected by Article 8. This Article imposes on States a positive obligation to secure to their citizens the right to effective respect for their physical and psychological integrity. This obligation may involve the adoption of specific measures, including the provision of an effective and accessible means of protecting the right to respect for private life."*

Most recently, the **Constitutional Court** has discussed the issue of the recognition of gender and name in relation to the case of a transgender refugee in its **decision No. 6/2018. (VI. 27.)** (in case of the petitioner, the ECHR also found a breach of the Convention in *Rana v. Hungary*). The Constitutional Court pointed out that the legal recognition of gender is related to the essential content of one's privacy and to the innermost core of human dignity. That latter has been declared an **inviolable fundamental right** under the consistent case-law of the court in the last 30 years since its decision No. 23/1990. (X. 31.).

The CC has confirmed that it continues to consider the regulation on the changing of names (without regard to legal status, citizenship, or alien policing status) as a question of fundamental rights, and a special case of that is the change of name connected to gender reassignment, which is based on the identity of "HUMAN" [Article 1(1) of the Fundamental Law] and the inviolability of equal human dignity. In the opinion of the CC, "*the special name changing connected to gender reassignment as a fundamental determinant of a person's identity, as a right to have one's own name, shall fall into the unrestrictable realm of the right to have a name. The change of name is auxiliary to gender reassignment as everyone is entitled to have a name aligned with his or her gender, indeed, it is their obligation to have a name complying with their actual gender registered into the registries."*

In the case of the petitioner the CC established the existence of a situation contrary to the Fundamental Law, manifested in a legislative omission to make the legal recognition of gender and name available for transgender refugees in Hungary, and called upon the National Assembly to meet its legislative duty by 31 December 2018, which the National Assembly has failed to do so.

Tamás Sulyok the President of the Constitutional Court, in his concurring opinion pointed out that although the individual case under review was initiated by the petition of a transgender refugee, the (then available)



Hungarian Helsinki Committee

HUNGARIAN HELSINKI COMMITTEE

H-1074 Budapest, Dohány utca 20. II/9.

P.O. Box: H-1242 Budapest, Pf. 317.

Tel/fax: + 36 1 321 4323, 321 4141, 321 4327

helsinki@helsinki.hu

www.helsinki.hu

procedure for the legal recognition of gender and name available for Hungarian citizens was not reassuring either:

"Due to being bound to the petition, the Constitutional Court could not take a position on the constitutionality of the regulations that apply to transsexual persons who are Hungarian citizens, however, in my opinion, the reasoning of the majority decision has an implication on the merits of it. (...) Taking into account the Constitutional Court's practice connected to the rule laid down in Article I (3) of the Fundamental Law, I hold it necessary to call the attention of the legislator to the fact that the present government decree-level regulation of the name change attached to the gender reassignment of Hungarian citizens needs to be reviewed. (...) Based on the above, I hold that the legislator should consider the re-regulation of the whole issue on the appropriate level of the sources of law, taking Hungarian citizens into account as well, and similarly to the Act of Parliament adopted in Germany decades ago (Gesetz über die Änderung der Vornamen und die Feststellung der Geschlechtszugehörigkeit in besonderen Fällen), the adoption of a separate Act on the legal recognition of gender should be taken into consideration."

4. The application of the above to the present case

Based on the above, Section 33 amounts to a serious violation of the respect for human dignity of transgender and intersex persons, and, stemming from that, their rights to self-determination, the right to bear one's own name, and the right to private life [Article VI(1) of the Fundamental Law].

Under Article II of the Fundamental Law: *"Human dignity shall be inviolable. Every human being shall have the right to life and human dignity; the life of the foetus shall be protected from the moment of conception."*

Under the case-law of the ECHR and the Constitutional Court the recognition of gender and name are part of such an essential and innermost core of one's personality that under no circumstances may it be subject to any restriction by the state. Therefore, together with the right to life and the prohibition of torture, the right to respect for human dignity is an **absolute fundamental right**.

Contrary to what the representative of the government submitting the Amending Act alleged, the prohibition of the legal recognition of gender results in a deeply adversary situation interfering with the core element of one's identity on a daily basis, in a way that is incompatible with the respect for human dignity. In the view of the Hungarian Helsinki Committee, the reports of transgender people referred to in point 2, their situation in Hungarian society, and the seriously adverse psychological effects of Section 33 on the individual and the community support that interpretation without any doubt. By forcing transgender people to use an official name and gender opposite to their identity, the State practically denies them the right to freely determine their own personalities.

No one can freely enjoy his or her identity who may be forced at any time to uncover his or her transgender character even in the most basic situations of everyday life by being called upon by strangers, as they wish, to show his or her personal identification documents. By doing so, the life of "HUMAN" may be reduced to a series of vulnerable situations, which is formally incompatible with the inviolable right to respect for human dignity.

Under Article VI(1) of the Fundamental Law: *"Everyone shall have the right to have his or her private and family life, home, communications and good reputation respected. Exercising the right to freedom of expression and assembly shall not impair the private and family life and home of others."*



Hungarian Helsinki Committee

HUNGARIAN HELSINKI COMMITTEE

H-1074 Budapest, Dohány utca 20. II/9.

P.O. Box: H-1242 Budapest, Pf. 317.

Tel/fax: + 36 1 321 4323, 321 4141, 321 4327

helsinki@helsinki.hu

www.helsinki.hu

Although we are of the view, that based on the above, Section 33 violates the right to human dignity (which necessarily entails a violation of the right to private life), it also entails a serious violation of the right to private life itself, as well, according to the following.

Under Article I(3) of the Fundamental Law: "*[t]he rules for fundamental rights and obligations shall be laid down in an Act. A fundamental right may only be restricted to allow the effective use of another fundamental right or to protect a constitutional value, to the extent absolutely necessary, proportionate to the objective pursued and with full respect for the essential content of that fundamental right.*"

The government could not refer to any legitimate reason as to why Section 33 was a necessary piece of legislation to enact, neither in the explanatory memorandum to the Amending Act or the public communications that have been made since. There is simply no fundamental right or constitutional value to be identified, the protection of which could be attained only by means of rendering the legal recognition of gender and name impossible (cf. case of Christine Goodwin, § 93). We note that it would not even be for the party challenging the constitutionality of the norm to identify those, but for the actor proposing the amendment, who is, in this case, the government.

With respect to the fact that the government, up to present day, has failed to give any meaningful reasoning acceptable from a fundamental rights perspective, Section 33 fails the constitutional test applicable to the restriction of fundamental rights.

5. Conclusion and explicit request

A democratic state respecting the rule of law is necessarily freedom-loving and diverse. It accepts that human existence is diverse and one of its basic premises is that nobody's personality, the innermost core of his or her human being, may be impaired based on any ideology.

The Hungarian Helsinki Committee is convinced that a democracy can only be thriving and properly functioning if it grants protection to the whole range of human diversity and offers real opportunities for everybody to fulfill their human potential. Consequently, there are no constitutional or moral arguments which could in any way support upholding Section 33.

Accordingly, we hereby request, Mr. Commissioner, that you file a petition with the Constitutional Court requesting that Court to declare that point x) of Section 3, point be) of Section 69/B(1) and Section 69/B(3) of the Act on Civil Registration violate the Fundamental Law and to declare those provisions null and void, and, moreover, requesting that Court to declare that the unavailability of a procedure for the legal recognition of the gender and name of transgender persons results in unconstitutionality by omission that shall be rectified by the law-maker.

Sincerely yours,

András Kádár
co-chair
Hungarian Helsinki Committee