



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)

The Court dealt with 328 applications concerning Slovakia in 2016, of which 318 were declared inadmissible or struck out. It delivered 10 judgments (concerning 10 applications), 9 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	353	309	183
Communicated to the Government	29	43	33
Applications decided:	359	328	204
- Declared inadmissible or struck out (Single Judge)	311	288	182
- Declared inadmissible or struck out (Committee)	28	28	7
- Declared inadmissible or struck out (Chamber)	5	2	1
- Decided by judgment	15	10	14
Interim measures:	10	4	0
- Granted	3	0	0
- Refused (including out of scope)	7	4	0

* 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	228
Applications pending before a judicial formation:	149
Single Judge	39
Committee (3 Judges)	31
Chamber (7 Judges)	79
Grand Chamber (17 Judges)	0

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

Slovakia 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 Slovakia to the Council of Europe's (EUR 328 million) budget is **EUR 1,496,338**.

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 **9** are Slovakian.

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 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

Lakatošová and Lakatoš v. Slovakia (no. 655/16)

Application [communicated](#) to the Slovakian Government in November 2016

The application concerns a murder of three and an attempted murder of two Slovak nationals of Roma origin by an off-duty municipal police officer.

The applicants rely on Articles 2 (right to life), 2 in conjunction with Article 13 (right to an effective remedy) and 14 (prohibition of discrimination) of the Convention.

MAC TV s.r.o. v. Slovakia (no. 13466/12)

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

The application concerns administrative proceedings brought against the applicant, a TV broadcaster and network provider, for broadcasting a sarcastic and provocative commentary after the plane crash of the late President of Poland, Lech Kaczyński and a financial sanction of EUR 5,000 imposed on it.

The applicant relies on Article 10 (freedom of expression) of the Convention.

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

Application [communicated](#) to the Slovakian 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.

Mansour v. Slovakia (no. 60399/15)

Application [communicated](#) to the Slovakian Government in July 2016

The application concerns an international child-abduction case. In this respect, it deals primarily with the proceedings for the enforcement of a final and binding return order issued under the *Brussels II bis Regulation* and the *Hague Convention*.

Mr Mansour relies on Article 8 (right to respect for family life) of the Convention.

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

Application [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.

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