



Andorra

Ratified the European Convention on Human Rights in 1996

National Judge: Pere Pastor Vilanova (2015-2024)

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

Juge precedent: Josep Casadevall (1998-2015)

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

The Court dealt with 11 applications concerning Andorra in 2021, of which 10 were declared inadmissible or struck out. It delivered one judgment (concerning one application), which did not find any violation of the European Convention on Human Rights.

Applications processed in	2018	2019	2020
Applications allocated to a judicial formation	3	6	11
Communicated to Government	0	0	0
Applications decided:	2	7	11
- Declared inadmissible or struck out (Single Judge)	2	7	10
- Declared inadmissible or struck out (Committee)	0	0	0
- Declared inadmissible or struck out (Chamber)	0	0	0
- Decided by judgment	0	0	1

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 01/01/2021	
Total pending applications*	3
Applications pending before a judicial formation:	1
Single Judge	0
Committee (3 Judges)	1
Chamber (7 Judges)	0
Grand Chamber (17 Judges)	0

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

Andorra 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 **641** Registry staff members.

Noteworthy cases, judgments delivered

Cases dealing with Article 6

Right to a fair hearing

[Chong Coronado v. Andorra](#)

23.07.2020

The case concerned criminal proceedings leading to the applicant's conviction *in absentia* at first instance. The applicant complained that he had not been able to lodge an appeal as he would first have had to travel to Andorra in person to appear before the first-instance court which had convicted him. He argued that, if he had done so, he would have immediately been imprisoned.

[Violation of Article 6 § 1](#)

[UTE Saur Vallnet v. Andorra](#)

29.05.2012

The case concerned a complaint made by a business consortium about an alleged lack of impartiality and independence of the Administrative Division of the High Court of Justice of the Principality of Andorra. The reporting judge of the Administrative Division having heard its case on appeal was at the same time a partner in a Barcelona law firm providing legal services to the Andorran Government in other proceedings.

[Violation of Article 6 § 1](#)

[Vidal Escoll and Guillan González v. Andorra](#)

09.07.2008

Failure to execute a judgment ordering the partial demolition of two buildings facing the applicants homes which exceeded the authorised height. The applicants applied to have the planning permits set aside and complained that the expropriation of part of their properties to widen the road was aimed solely at preventing the execution of the judgment.

[Violation of Article 6 § 1](#)

Other noteworthy cases, judgments delivered

[Figueiredo Teixeira v. Andorra](#)

08.11.2016

The case concerned the storage and communication to the judicial authority of data from telephone calls made by the applicant, who was suspected of the serious offence of drug trafficking.

[No violation of Article 8 \(right to respect for private and family life\)](#)

[Gouarré Patte v. Andorra](#)

12.01.2016

The case concerned the fact that it was impossible for the applicant, a doctor, to obtain revision of an ancillary penalty entailing a lifetime ban on practising his profession.

[Violation of Article 7 \(no punishment without law\)](#)

[Violation of Article 13 \(right to an effective remedy\) taken together with Article 7](#)

[Ball v. Andorra](#)

11.12.2012

The applicant complained that, pending his appeal in divorce proceedings, the domestic courts had refused to enforce a final judicial decision which had set up a contact schedule with his two children.

[No-violation of Article 8 \(right to respect for private and family life\)](#)

[Pla and Puncernau v. Andorra](#)

13.07.2004

A case concerning court rulings that the applicant, an adopted child, could not inherit because he was not "a son of a lawful and canonical marriage" as stipulated in the deceased's will.

[Violation of Article 14 \(prohibition of discrimination\) in conjunction with Article 8 \(right to respect for private and family life\)](#)

Noteworthy cases, decisions delivered

[Solanelles Mollar v. Andorra](#)

20.03.2012

The case concerned the tapping of the applicant's telephone in the context of

criminal proceedings against another person.

Application declared inadmissible as being manifestly ill-founded.

Orosa Iglesias v. Andorra

31.05.2011

The applicant, her husband, her daughter and the company run by the daughter were all declared bankrupt. The applicant complained, *inter alia*, that the related proceedings had lasted more than nine years.

Application declared inadmissible (manifestly ill-founded)

Torres Duedra and others v. Andorra

13.11.2008

A case concerning judicial review proceedings relating to an application for planning permission. Relying on Article 6 (right of access to a court), the applicants contested the calculation of the time-limit for the authorities' "tacit refusal".

Application declared inadmissible (manifestly ill-founded)

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