



Portugal

Ratified the European Convention on Human Rights in 1978

National Judge: Paulo Pinto De Albuquerque

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

Previous Judges: Ireneu Cabral Barreto (1998-2011), João de Deus Pinheiro Farinha (1977-1991), Manuel António Lopes Rocha (1991-1998)

The Court dealt with 302 applications concerning Portugal in 2016, of which 269 were declared inadmissible or struck out. It delivered 19 judgments (concerning 33 applications), 17 of which found at least one violation of the European Convention on Human Rights.

Applications processed in	2015	2016	2017*
Applications allocated to a judicial formation	233	153	102
Communicated to the Government	91	14	1
Applications decided:	189	302	102
- Declared inadmissible or struck out (Single Judge)	127	225	88
- Declared inadmissible or struck out (Committee)	38	43	8
- Declared inadmissible or struck out (Chamber)	4	1	1
- Decided by judgment	20	33	5
Interim measures:	2	6	4
- Granted	1	0	0
- Refused (including out of scope)	1	6	4

* January to July 2017

For information about the Court's judicial formations and procedure, see the [ECHR internet site](#).

Applications pending before the court on 01/07/2017	
Total pending Applications*	230
Applications pending before a judicial formation:	176
Single Judge	43
Committee (3 Judges)	10
Chamber (7 Judges)	117
Grand Chamber (17 Judges)	6

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

Portugal and ...

Its contribution to the Court's budget

For 2017 the Court's budget amounts to approximately 71 million euros. That budget is financed by contributions from the 47 member States of the Council of Europe in accordance with scales based on population and GDP; the 2017 contribution of Portugal to the Council of Europe's (EUR 328 million) budget is **EUR 3,298,040**.

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 **672** Registry staff members of whom **8** are Portuguese.

Noteworthy cases, judgments and decisions delivered

Grand Chamber

Cases regarding article 6

[Moreira Ferreira v. Portugal \(no. 2\)](#)

11.07.2017

The case concerned the rejection by the Supreme Court of a request lodged by the applicant for revision of a criminal judgment following a judgment delivered by the European Court of Human Rights on 5 July 2011.

[No violation of Article 6 § 1 \(right to a fair trial\)](#)

Protection of property cases (Article 1 of Protocol No. 1)

[Anheuser-Busch Inc. v. Portugal](#)

11.01.2007

The applicant company, based in the United States, produces Budweiser beer and exports it internationally. It complained that it was unable to market its beer in Portugal, since the designation Budweiser was reserved for a Czech company distributing its own beer under that name.

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

[Perdigão v. Portugal](#)

16.11.2010

The court fees which the applicants had to pay in expropriation proceedings were higher than the amount of compensation awarded to them.

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

Noteworthy cases, judgments and decisions delivered

Chamber

Cases dealing with Article 6

[Right to a fair hearing](#)

[Antunes Rocha v. Portugal](#)

31.05.2005

In 1994 the applicant signed a temporary employment contract with the National Council for Emergency Civil Planning (CNPCE). She complained in particular that she had been investigated without her knowledge or consent.

[Violation of Article 6 § 1 and Article 8 \(right to respect for private and family life\)](#)

[Moreira Ferreira v. Portugal](#)

05.07.2011

Relying in particular on Article 6 § 1 (right to a fair trial), Ms Moreira Ferreira complained that she had not been heard by the Oporto Court of Appeal in criminal proceedings brought against her for threats and insults, resulting in a sentence of 265 hours of community service.

[Violation of Article 6 § 1](#)

[Ferreira Santos Pardal v. Portugal](#)

30.07.2015

The case concerned the dismissal of an action for civil liability brought by the applicant against the State, a dismissal which was contrary to the Supreme Court's settled case-law in the matter.

[Violation of Article 6 § 1](#)

[Ramos Nunes de Carvalho E Sá v. Portugal and Tato Marinho Dos Santos Costa Alves Dos Santos and Figueiredo v. Portugal](#)

21.06.2016

The cases concerned disciplinary proceedings brought against three judges on conclusion of which the High Council of the Judiciary (HCJ) imposed disciplinary penalties, and the review carried out by the Supreme Court of Justice as an appeal body.

[Violation of Article 6 § 1](#)

[Right to a fair hearing within a reasonable time](#)

[Flores Cardoso v. Portugal](#)

29.05.2012

The case concerned repayment by the State of a sum of money which the applicants had deposited with the Portuguese consulate in Mozambique when leaving the former Portuguese colony following the outbreak of civil war in 1976. The situation apparently concerns some 3,000 people. Mr Flores

Cardoso complained that no account was taken of the depreciation in currency or of inflation when the money was repaid to him.

[Violation of Article 6 § 1](#)

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

Valada Matos Das Neves v. Portugal

29.10.2015

Excessive length of domestic proceedings brought by the applicant to challenge the termination of his contract of employment, and the lack of an effective remedy to provide redress on that account.

[Violation of Article 6 § 1](#)

[Violation of Article 13 \(right to an effective remedy\)](#)

[Right of access to a court](#)

Lacerda Gouveia and Others v. Portugal

01.03.2011

"Camarate case" - concerning death of then Prime Minister and Minister of Defence in a plane crash.

[No violation of Article 6 § 1 \(the Portuguese courts were not negligent\)](#)

[Presumption of innocence](#)

Melo Tadeu v. Portugal

23.10.2014

[Violation of Article 6 § 2](#)

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

Cases dealing with private and/or family life (Article 8)

Dore v. Portugal and Karoussiotis v. Portugal

01.02.2011

Proceedings concerning international child abduction ineffective.

[Violation of Article 8 in each case](#)

Santos Nunes v. Portugal

22.05.2012

The case concerned the enforcement of a decision granting Mr Santos Nunes custody of his child, whom the mother had placed in the care of another couple.

[Violation of Article 8](#)

Sérvulo & Associados - Sociedade de Advogados, RI v. Portugal

03.09.2015

The case concerned the search of a law firm's offices and the seizure of computer

files and email messages, during an investigation into suspected corruption, acquisition of prohibited interests and money laundering in connection with the purchase by the Portuguese Government of two submarines from a German consortium.

[No violation of Article 8](#)

Brito Ferrinho Bexiga Villa-Nova v. Portugal

01.12.2015

The case concerned access to the bank accounts of a lawyer charged with tax fraud.

[Violation of Article 8](#)

Soares de Melo v. Portugal

16.02.2016

The case concerned an order for seven of Ms Soares de Melo's children to be taken into care with a view to their adoption, and its enforcement in respect of six of them.

[Violation of Article 8](#)

Freedom of expression cases (Article 10)

Lopes Gomes da Silva v. Portugal

28.09.2000

Conviction of the manager of the daily newspaper *Público* for libel.

[Violation of Article 10](#)

Colaço Mestre and SIC – Sociedade Independente de Comunicação S.A. v. Portugal

26.04.2007

A journalist and a television channel were convicted of libel following a criminal complaint by the President of the Portuguese Professional Football League and chairman of FC Porto football club.

[Violation of Article 10](#)

Women on Waves and Others v. Portugal

03.02.2009

The applicants are associations which had chartered a ship for the purpose of holding information meetings on matters including abortion. The ship was banned from entering Portuguese territorial waters by a ministerial order and its entry was blocked by a Portuguese warship.

[Violation of Article 10](#)

[Campos Dâmaso v. Portugal and Laranjeira Marques da Silva v. Portugal](#)

24.04.2008 and 19.01.2010

Journalists convicted of offences including breaching the secrecy of judicial investigations (*segredo de justiça*).

Violation of Article 10 in each case.

[Público - Comunicação Social, S.A. and Others v. Portugal](#)

07.12.2010

Award of damages against Público newspaper for harming the reputation of "Sporting Clube de Portugal".

Violation of Article 10

[Barata Monteiro da Costa Nogueira and Patrício Pereira v. Portugal](#)

11.01.2011

Conviction of politicians who publicly accused an opponent of serious criminal conduct.

No violation of Article 10

[Conceição Letria v. Portugal](#)

12.04.2011

Conviction of journalist Joaquim Letria for defamation of a politician.

Violation of Article 10

[Pinto Coelho v. Portugal](#)

28.06.2011

Automatic application of publication ban.

Violation of Article 10

[Almeida Leitão Bento Fernandes v. Portugal](#)

12.03.2015

The case concerned the criminal conviction of Ms Fernandes for libelling a number of her in-laws, following publication of a novel relating family dramas in the context of the Portuguese diaspora in the United States and the colonial war.

No violation of Article 10

[Pinto Coelho v. Portugal](#)

22.03.2016

The case concerned the criminal-law fine imposed on Ms Pinto Coelho, a journalist, for having broadcast in a news report excerpts which included sound recordings from a court hearing, obtained without permission from the judge.

Violation of Article 10

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

[Almeida Garrett, Mascarenhas Falcão and Others v. Portugal](#)

11.01.2000

The case concerned the expropriation and nationalisation of land as part of the agrarian reform implemented in Portugal after the 1974 revolution. The applicants received interim compensation in the form of Government bonds, but had yet to receive final compensation by the time of the Court's judgment.

Violation of Article 1 of Protocol No. 1

Noteworthy cases, decisions delivered

[P. v. Portugal](#) (no. 56027/09)

06.09.2011

At birth, the applicant was registered as male. On reaching adulthood, she underwent gender reassignment treatment followed by surgery. She complained of the lack of legal recognition of her situation, coupled with the alleged absence of any legislation on the matter. **First case of its kind concerning Portugal.** Her request for legal recognition to the domestic courts was successful.

Application struck out of the Court's list of cases.

[Da Conceição Mateus v. Portugal and Santos Januário v. Portugal](#)

08.10.2013

The cases concerned the payment of the applicants' public sector pensions, which were reduced in 2012 as a result of cuts to Portuguese government spending. The Court examined the compatibility of the reductions of the applicants' pension payments with Article 1 of Protocol No.1 (protection of property).

Applications declared inadmissible as manifestly ill-founded.

[da Silva Carvalho Rico v. Portugal](#)

24.09.2015

The case concerned the reduction of retirement pensions following austerity measures taken in Portugal, in particular the extraordinary solidarity contribution ("CES").

Application declared inadmissible as manifestly ill-founded.

Noteworthy pending cases

Grand Chamber

Ramos Nunes de Carvalho e Sá v. Portugal (nos. 55391/13, 57728/13 and 74041/13)

The case concerns disciplinary proceedings brought against a judge.

Relying on Article 6 § 1 (right to a fair hearing), the applicant alleges a breach of her right to an independent and impartial tribunal, her right to obtain a review of the facts established by the HCJ and her right to a public hearing.

In its Chamber [judgment](#) of 21 juin 2016, the Court held, unanimously, that there had been a violation of Article 6 § 1 (right to a fair trial) of the Convention.

Case [referred](#) to the Grand Chamber on 17 October 2016

Grand Chamber [hearing](#) on 22 March 2017

Correia de Matos v. Portugal (no. 56402/12)

The case concerns criminal proceedings brought against the applicant, a lawyer, for insulting a judge, and the fact that he was not permitted to conduct his own defence in those proceedings because the domestic courts required him to be represented by a lawyer.

Relying on Article 6 § 3 (c) (right to legal assistance of one's own choosing), the applicant complains of the decisions of the

domestic courts refusing him leave to conduct his own defence in the criminal proceedings against him and requiring that he be represented by a lawyer.

The Chamber [relinquished](#) jurisdiction in favor of the Grand Chamber on 13 September 2016

Grand Chamber [hearing](#) on 8 February 2017

Lopes de Sousa Fernandes v. Portugal (no. 56080/13)

The case concerns the death of Ms Lopes de Sousa Fernandes' husband following nasal polyp surgery and the subsequent procedures opened for medical negligence.

Relying in particular on Article 2 (right to life) of the Convention, Ms Lopez de Sousa Fernandes alleges that there has been a violation of her late husband's right to life.

In its Chamber [judgment](#) of 15 December 2015, the Court held, by five votes to two, that there had been a violation of Article 2 (right to life) of the Convention as to the right to life and, unanimously, that there had been a violation of Article 2 as concerned the related investigation.

Case [referred](#) to the Grand Chamber on 2 May 2016

Grand Chamber [hearing](#) on 16 November 2016

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