



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

Press Unit
Unité de la Presse

Press country profile Fiche pays pour la presse

Last updated: July 2019

Slovakia

Ratified the European Convention on Human Rights in 1993 (Czech and Slovak Federal Republic)

National Judge: Alena Poláčková

[Judges' CVs](#) are available on the ECHR Internet site

Previous Judges: Bohumil Repik (1992-1998), Viera Strážnická (1998-2004), Ján Šikuta (2004-2015)

[List of judges of the Court since 1959](#)

The Court dealt with 439 applications concerning Slovakia in 2018, of which 420 were declared inadmissible or struck out. It delivered 11 judgments (concerning 19 applications), 8 of which found at least one violation of the European Convention on Human Rights.

Applications processed in	2017	2018	2019*
Applications allocated to a judicial formation	425	390	177
Communicated to the Government	47	32	24
Applications decided:	395	439	180
- Declared inadmissible or struck out (Single Judge)	354	391	152
- Declared inadmissible or struck out (Committee)	22	27	24
- Declared inadmissible or struck out (Chamber)	1	2	0
- Decided by judgment	18	19	4

* January to July 2019

For information about the Court's judicial formations and procedure, see the [ECHR internet site](#).
Statistics on interim measures can be found [here](#).

Applications pending before the court on 01/07/2019	
Total pending applications*	196
Applications pending before a judicial formation:	151
Single Judge	28
Committee (3 Judges)	32
Chamber (7 Judges)	91
Grand Chamber (17 Judges)	0

* including applications for which completed application forms have not been received

Slovakia and ...

The Registry

The task of the Registry is to provide legal and administrative support to the Court in the exercise of its judicial functions. It is composed of lawyers, administrative and technical staff and translators. There are currently **643** Registry staff members.

Noteworthy cases, judgments delivered

Grand Chamber

[Kopecký v. Slovakia](#)

28.09.2004

Applicant unable to secure the return of gold and silver coins which had been confiscated from him on the ground that he could not show where the coins had been located on 1 April 1991, as required by law. [No violation of Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 \(protection of property\)](#)

Noteworthy cases, judgments delivered

Chamber

Cases dealing with the right to life (Article 2)

[Mižigárová v. Slovakia](#)

14.12.2010

Failure to carry out an appropriate investigation into a fatal injury which the applicant's husband – of Roma origin – suffered at a police station.

[Two violations of Article 2 \(death and lack of effective investigation\)](#)

[No violation of Article 14 \(prohibition of discrimination\) in conjunction with Article 2](#)

[Dvořáček and Dvořáčková v. Slovakia](#)

28.07.2009

Protracted duration of proceedings concerning shortcomings in medical care allegedly leading to death of the applicants' daughter.

[Violation of Article 2 \(lack of effective investigation\)](#)

[Violation of Article 6 § 1 \(right to a fair hearing within a reasonable time\)](#)

[Kontrová v. Slovakia](#)

31.05.2007

Slovakia's failure to protect the life of the applicants' children, killed by her husband after she had filed a complaint against him and even though the police had received emergency calls reporting her husband's intentions shortly before the killings.

[Violation of Article 2](#)

Violation of Article 13 (right to an effective remedy)

Cases dealing with inhuman or degrading treatment (Article 3)

[Adam v. Slovakia](#)

26.07.2016

The case concerned an allegation by a young Roma, Jaroslav Adam, that he had been slapped in the face when being questioned by the police in 2010 about a mugging and that the related investigation was inadequate.

[No violation of Article 3 as concerned Mr Adam's allegation of having been slapped in police custody](#)

[Violation of Article 3 as concerned Mr Adam's complaint about the inadequate investigation into his allegation of ill-treatment](#)

[Koky and Others v. Slovakia](#)

12.06.2012

The case concerned an allegedly racially motivated assault by private individuals against a group of people of Roma origin in a village in Slovakia.

[Violation of Article 3](#)

[Labsi v. Slovakia](#)

15.05.2012

The case concerned the expulsion of an Algerian man, convicted in France of preparing a terrorist act, from Slovakia following his unsuccessful asylum request.

[Violation of Article 3, Article 13 \(right to an effective remedy\) and Article 34 \(right of individual petition\)](#)

[E.S. and Others v. Slovakia \(no. 8227/04\)](#)

15.09.2009

Failure to provide adequate protection against domestic violence.

[Violation of Article 3](#)

[Violation of Article 8 \(right to respect for family and private life\)](#)

Cases concerning the right to liberty et security (Article 5)

[Lexa \(No. 2\) v. Slovakia](#)

05.01.2010

Flaws in procedure concerning review of lawfulness of the applicant's (former

director of the Slovakian intelligence service) detention on remand.

[Violation of Article 5 § 4](#)

[No violation of Article 5 § 1](#)

[Kučera v. Slovakia](#)

17.07.2007

Length and unlawfulness of applicant's detention on remand, during which he was refused visits from his wife. The police also entered his apartment unlawfully.

[No violation of Article 5 § 1](#)

[Violation of Article 5 §§ 3 and 4](#)

[Violations of Article 8 \(right to respect for private and family life\)](#)

Cases dealing with Article 6

[Right to a fair trial](#)

[DRAFT - OVA a.s. v. Slovakia](#)

[PSMA, spol. s r.o. v. Slovakia](#)

[COMPCAR, s.r.o. v. Slovakia](#)

09.06.2015

The three cases concerned the quashing of final and binding judgments in favour of three companies following an extraordinary appeal on points of law.

[In the case of DRAFT - OVA a.s.:](#)

[Violation of Article 6](#)

[Violation of Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 \(protection of property\)](#)

[- In the cases of PSMA, spol. s r.o. and COMPCAR, s.r.o.:](#)

[Violation of Article 6](#)

[Harabin v. Slovakia](#)

20.11.2012

The case concerned the imposition of a disciplinary sanction on the President of the Slovak Supreme Court for having prevented an audit at that court, and in particular his complaint that several of the judges who decided his case were biased.

[Violation of Article 6 § 1](#)

[Right of access to a court](#)

[Paluda v. Slovakia](#)

23.05.2017

The case concerned the inability of a judge to challenge in court a decision to suspend him from office. Mr Paluda, the applicant and judge of the Supreme Court, was suspended pending disciplinary proceedings against him for accusing the President of the Supreme Court of abuse of authority.

[Violation of Article 6 § 1](#)

[Lawyer Partners, A.S. v. Slovakia](#)

16.06.2009

Slovakian courts' refusal to register actions filed in electronic form.

[Violation of Article 6 § 1](#)

Cases regarding private and family life (Article 8)

[López Guió v. Slovakia](#)

03.06.2014

The case concerned an incident of international child abduction and the father's complaint that the proceedings he had brought before the ordinary courts in Slovakia for the return of his child to Spain had been arbitrarily interfered with by a judgment of the Constitutional Court of Slovakia.

[Violation of Article 8](#)

[Hajduová v. Slovakia](#)

30.11.2010

Authorities failed to protect the applicant from her former husband's abusive and threatening behaviour.

[Violation of Article 8](#)

[Kvasnica v. Slovakia](#)

09.06.2009

Unlawful interception of advocate's telephone conversations.

[Violation of Article 8](#)

Freedom of expression cases (Article 10)

[Ringier Axel Springer Slovakia, A.S. v. Slovakia \(no.2\) and Ringier Axel Springer Slovakia, A.S. v. Slovakia \(no.3\)](#)

07.01.2014

The cases concerned the liability of the applicant company for the content of certain articles published in *Nový Čas*, one of the most widely read newspapers in Slovakia. The first application concerned the applicant's liability for publishing the identities of the victim of a car accident and the victim's father. The second application concerned its liability for a separate series of articles which reported that a contestant on the quiz show 'Who Wants To Be A Millionaire?' was suspected of having cheated.

[Violation of Article 10](#)

Feldek v. Slovakia

12.07.2001

Applicant's conviction for defamation after the publication in the press of a statement in which he had made references to the "fascist past" of a government minister.

Violation of Article 10

No violation of Article 14 (prohibition of discrimination)

Cases regarding discrimination (Article 14)

Lakatošová and Lakatoš v. Slovakia

11.12.2018

The case concerned a shooting spree in 2012 by an off-duty police officer at the home of a Roma family. The two applicants in the case, a married couple, were seriously injured and three members of their family were killed.

Violation of Article 14 read in conjunction with Article 2 (right to life)

Cases dealing with property issues (Article 1 of protocol No. 1)

Urbárska obec Trenčianske Biskupice v. Slovakia

27.11.2007

Compulsory letting of the applicant association's land and the transfer of that land to the tenants.

Violation of Article 1 of Protocol No. 1

Cases concerning allegations of sterilisation of Roma women without their informed consent

I.G., M.K. and R.H. v. Slovakia (n°15966/04)

13.11.2012

Violation of Article 3 (treatment – on account of the first and second applicants' sterilisation)

Violation of Article 3 (investigation – in respect of the first and second applicants)

Violation of Article 8 (in respect of the first and second applicants)

No violation of Article 13

As regards the third applicant, the Court decided to strike the application out of its list of cases, under Article 37 § 1 (c) of the Convention.

N.B. v. Slovakia (no. 29518/10)

12.06.2012

Violation of Article 3 (treatment)

No violation of Article 3 (investigation)

Violation of Article 8

V.C. v. Slovakia (no. 18968/07)

08.11.2011

A violation of Article 3 (prohibition of inhuman or degrading treatment)

A violation of Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life)

K.H. and Others v. Slovakia (no. 32881/04)

28.04.2009

Violation of Article 6 § 1 (access to a court); violation of Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life); no violation of Article 13 (right to an effective remedy) in conjunction with Article 8

Noteworthy cases, decisions delivered

Ali Ibragimov v. Slovakia and Anzor Chentiev v. Slovakia

14.09.2010 (decision on the admissibility)

Extradition order concerning two Russian nationals of Chechen origin. Complaints under Articles 2 (right to life), 3 (prohibition of inhuman and degrading treatments) and 6 § 1 (right to a fair trial).

Application manifestly ill-founded, declared inadmissible.

Noteworthy pending cases

M.H. and Others v. Slovakia (no. 14099/18)

Case [communicated](#) to the Government on 17 September 2018

The application mainly concerns a police operation that took place on 19 June 2013 in a Roma community in Moldava nad Bodvou and the ensuing investigation, conducted by the Inspection Service of the Ministry of the Interior under the supervision of the Public Prosecution Service, into allegations of abuse of authority, ill-treatment and discrimination by the officers involved, during the operation itself and later at a police station. The applicants allege violations of Articles 3 (prohibition of inhuman or degrading treatment), 8 (right to respect for home), 13 (right to an effective remedy) and 14

(prohibition of discrimination) of the Convention.

M.B. and Others v. Slovakia (no. 45322/17)

Case [communicated](#) to the Government on 6 September 2018

The application concerns allegations that the three applicants, minor at the material time, were mistreated by a police officer in a police car on 21 March 2009 between their arrest on the suspicion of involvement in a robbery and their arrival at a police station, that the ensuing investigation into these allegations was inadequate, that they had no effective remedy in that respect, and that both their ill-treatment and lack of an adequate investigation into it were the result of discrimination against them on account of their Roma origin.

The applicants complain under Articles 3 (prohibition of inhuman or degrading treatment), 13 (right to an effective remedy) and 14 (prohibition of discrimination) of the Convention.

[X against Slovakia \(nos. 58361/12, 25592/16, and 27176/16\)](#) and [Y v. Slovakia \(nos. 58359/12, 27787/16 and 67667/16\)](#)

Cases communicated to the Government on 7 June and 5 October 2017 and 21 February 2018. The cases concern the impact on the applicants of a surveillance operation carried out by the Slovak Intelligence Service in 2005 and 2006 under a code name "Gorilla", the leak in December 2011 of a material purportedly based on the results of that operation, the investigation into the matters depicted in that material, and the applicant's efforts to protect their interests in that context. The applicants mainly complain under Articles 6 (right to a fair trial), 8 (private life), alone and in conjunction with Article 13 (right to an effective remedy) of the Convention.

[Puškárová v. Slovakia \(no. 19356/14\)](#), [Greňová v. Slovakia \(no. 26147/15\)](#) and [Neružil v. Slovakia \(no. 37016/15\)](#)

Cases communicated to the Government on 12 July 2017 and 13 July 2017. These cases concern the domestic courts' failure to communicate to the applicants, for information and/or comment, observations filed in the proceedings by the opposing party. All applicants complain under Article 6 § 1 (right to a fair trial) of the Convention.

A. P. v. Slovakia (no. 10465/17)

Case [communicated](#) to the Government on 21 June 2017

The applicant, being of Roma origin and sixteen years old at the time of the facts, complains under Articles 3 (prohibition of inhuman or degrading treatment), 13 (right to an effective remedy) and 14 (prohibition of discrimination) of the Convention that he was subjected to ill-treatment by beatings and psychological pressure inflicted by the police officers, that the authorities failed to conduct an effective investigation into the ill-treatment and that they failed to investigate possible racial motive of the ill-treatment.

Asady and Others v. Slovakia (no. 24917/15)

Case [communicated](#) to the Government in September 2016

The application concerns 19 Afghani nationals expelled from Slovakia to Ukraine on the same day they had entered the Slovak territory.

All applicants complain under Article 4 of Protocol No. 4 that their expulsion to Ukraine was collective in nature.

Relying on Article 13 in connection with Article 4 of Protocol No. 4 to the Convention, the applicants complain that they had no effective remedy through which to challenge their expulsion to Ukraine.

M.S. v. Slovakia and Ukraine (no. 17189/11)

Case [communicated](#) to the Slovakian and Ukrainian Governments in January 2016

The applicant complains that the Slovakian authorities returned him to Ukraine despite the risk that he would be subjected to degrading conditions of detention and the threat of indirect *refoulement* to Afghanistan, where, in turn, he faced a real risk of serious harm.

M.S. relies on Article 3 (inhuman or degrading treatment), taken alone and in conjunction with Article 13 (right to an effective remedy) and Article 5 § 2 (everyone who is arrested shall be informed promptly, in a language which he understands, of the reasons for his arrest and of any charge against him) of the Convention.

Press country profile - Slovakia

**ECHR Press Unit Contact:
+33 (0)3 90 21 42 08**