



Czech Republic

Ratified the European Convention on Human Rights in 1992

National Judge: Aleš Pejchal

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

Previous Judges: Karel Jungwiert (1998-2012)

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

The Court dealt with 277 applications concerning Czech Republic in 2019, which were declared inadmissible or struck out. It delivered no judgment.

Applications processed in	2018	2019	2020*
Applications allocated to a judicial formation	348	300	198
Communicated to the Government	7	16	9
Applications decided:	347	277	179
- Declared inadmissible or struck out (Single Judge)	328	272	177
- Declared inadmissible or struck out (Committee)	5	5	1
- Declared inadmissible or struck out (Chamber)	0	0	0
- Decided by judgment	14	0	1

* January to July 2020

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 03/07/2020	
Total pending applications*	174
Applications pending before a judicial formation:	141
Single Judge	37
Committee (3 Judges)	14
Chamber (7 Judges)	84
Grand Chamber (17 Judges)	6

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

Czech Republic 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 **626** Registry staff members.

Noteworthy cases, judgments delivered

Grand Chamber

Dubská and Krejzová v. the Czech Republic

15.11.2016

The case concerned a law in the Czech Republic which made it impossible in practice for mothers to be assisted by a midwife during home births.

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

Rohlena v. Czech Republic

27.01.2015

The case concerned the applicant's conviction for a continuous criminal offence of abusing a person living under the same roof. The applicant complained in particular that his conviction encompassed his conduct before that offence had been introduced into the law on 1 June 2004.

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

D.H. and Others v. Czech Republic (no. 57325/00)

13.11.2007

Placement of Roma children in special schools.

[Violation of Article 14 \(prohibition of discrimination\) together with Article 2 of Protocol No. 1 \(right to education\)](#)

Cases regarding Article 6

Right to a fair trial

Regner v. the Czech Republic

19.09.2017

The case concerned an administrative decision withdrawing the security clearance which was a prerequisite for Mr Regner to hold a senior post in the Ministry of Defence.

[No violation of Article 6 § 1](#)

Malhous v. Czech Republic

12.07.2001

No public hearing in restitution proceedings to recover farmland.

[Violation of Article 6 § 1](#)

Noteworthy cases, judgments delivered

Chamber

Cases dealing with Article 6

Right to a fair trial

Tempel v. the Czech Republic

25.06.2020

The case concerned repeated first-instance and appeal proceedings over a period of 10 years on a charge of murder.

[Violation of Article 6 § 1 owing to a lack of fairness of the applicant's conviction for murder](#)

[Violation of Article 6 § 1 owing to the length of the proceedings](#)

Suda v. Czech Republic

28.10.2010

Compulsory arbitration for squeezed-out minority shareholders concerning the compensation for their shares.

[Violation of Article 6 § 1](#)

Družstevní záložna Pria and Others v. Czech Republic

31.07.2008

Compulsory administration imposed on credit union.

[Violations of Article 6 § 1](#)

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

Krasniki v. Czech Republic

28.02.2006

Applicant's conviction based exclusively on anonymous witness testimony.

[Violation of Article 6 §§ 1 and 3 d\)](#)

Vodárenská akciová společnost v. Czech Republic and Faltejsek v. Czech Republic

24.02.2004 and 15.02.2008

Excessive formalism of the Constitutional Court.

[Violation of Article 6 § 1](#)

Credit and Industrial Bank v. Czech Republic

21.10.2003

Decision of compulsory administration imposed on the applicant bank.

Violation of Article 6 § 1 - lack of full judicial review in the administrative proceedings

Běleš and Others v. Czech Republic and Zvolský and Zvolská v. Czech Republic

12.11.2002

Lack of access to the Constitutional Court in proceedings respectively related to a decision by the Medical Society to strike the Homeopathic Association off its list of members and agricultural land ownership issues.

Violations of Article 6 § 1 in both cases, and Violation of Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 (protection of property) in Zvolský and Zvolská

Krcmár v. Czech Republic and Milatová and Others v. Czech Republic

03.03.2000 and 21.06.2005

Lack of contradictory procedure before the Constitutional Court.

Violations of Article 6 § 1

Right to a fair trial within a reasonable time

Kříž v. Czech Republic and Mezl v. Czech Republic

09.01.2007

Length of proceedings concerning fathers' right of contact with their children, and Mr Mezl's parental responsibility. Prolonged inability to secure the enforcement of the decisions granting them rights of contact.

In each case: Violation of Articles 6 and 8 (right to respect for private and family life)

Cases dealing with the right of respect for private and family life (Article 8)

Macready v. Czech Republic

22.04.2010

Authorities failed to ensure father's right of contact with his son during proceedings for the son's return to the United States.

Violation of Article 8

Heglas v. Czech Republic

01.03.2007

Use in criminal proceedings of a listening device hidden under the applicant's girlfriend's clothing, and of the recording of his phone calls, under surveillance.

Two violations of Article 8

No violation of Article 6 § 1 (right to a fair trial)

Kříž v. Czech Republic and Mezl v. Czech Republic

09.01.2007

See case also dealing with Article 6 (Right to a fair trial within a reasonable time)

Wallová and Walla v. Czech Republic

26.10.2006

Placement of children in a public institution on the grounds that the family did not have a suitable and stable home.

Violation of Article 8

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

Družstevní záložna Pria and Others v. Czech Republic

31.07.2008

See case also dealing with Article 6 (right to a fair trial)

Pinc and Pincová v. Czech Republic

05.11.2002

Deprivation of property in restitution proceedings.

Violation of Article 1 of Protocol No. 1

Špacek, s.r.o. v. Czech Republic

09.11.1999

Penalty imposed on a company on the basis of the national tax law.

No violation of Article 1 of Protocol No. 1

Other noteworthy cases, judgments delivered

Dvořáček v. Czech Republic

06.11.2014

The case concerned the conditions surrounding the compulsory admission of the applicant, Mr Dvořáček, to a psychiatric hospital to undergo protective sexological treatment.

No violation of Article 3 (prohibition of inhuman or degrading treatment) with regard to the applicant's detention in a psychiatric hospital and the medical treatment administered

No violation of Article 3 concerning the investigation into the applicant's allegations of ill-treatment

Eremiášová and Pechová v. the Czech Republic (no. 23944/04)

16.02.2012

The case concerned the death of the applicants' relative, of Roma origin, following his allegedly jumping head-first

through a first-floor window at a police station where he had been taken on suspicion of burglary.

[Two violations of Article 2 \(right to life and investigation\)](#)

[Andrle v. Czech Republic](#)

17.02.2011

Alleged discrimination in the pension system on account of sex (different retirement age for women who care for children and for men in the same position).

[No violation of Article 14 \(prohibition of discrimination\) in conjunction with Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 \(protection of property\)](#)

[Husák v. Czech Republic](#)

04.12.2008

Dismissal without hearing of applications for release by the applicant who was in pre-trial detention.

[Violation of Article 5 § 4 \(right to have lawfulness of detention decided speedily by a court\)](#)

Noteworthy cases, decisions delivered

[Žirovnický v. the Czech Republic](#)

15.12.2016

These applications concern the detention conditions in a number of Czech prisons; the applicant alleged that those conditions constituted inhuman treatment, particularly on account of exposure to passive smoking (no. 60439/12) and prison overcrowding (no. 73999/12).

The Court has for the first time had the opportunity to rule on the remedies existing under Czech law as regards detention conditions.

[Applications declared inadmissible.](#)

[Veselský v. the Czech Republic](#)

31.03.2015

The applicant complained of a denial of justice by the Constitutional Court on the grounds that it had declared his appeal inadmissible without examining it on the merits.

[Application declared inadmissible as manifestly ill-founded.](#)

[Zelenka v. the Czech Republic](#)

25.11.2014

The case concerned the dismissal of an appeal of points of law for lack of legal representation.

[Application declared inadmissible for non-exhaustion of domestic remedies.](#)

[Polednová v. the Czech Republic](#)

06.07.2011

Question of whether the conviction of the last surviving participant in the 1950 trial of Milada Horáková and other opponents of the communist regime was compatible with the Convention.

[Application declared inadmissible as manifestly ill-founded.](#)

[Holub v. the Czech Republic and Bratři Zátkové, a.s. v. the Czech Republic](#)

14.12.2010 and 08.02.2011

Complaints declared inadmissible for lack of "significant disadvantage" (for the 1st time with regard to the Czech Republic).

[Applications declared inadmissible](#)

In its decisions in these cases, the Court **clarifies the application of the new admissibility criterion ("significant disadvantage")** introduced by Protocol No. 14, which entered into force on 1 June 2010. The introduction of this new criterion was considered necessary in view of the Court's constantly increasing workload, and is intended to enable it to focus on cases that justify an examination on the merits. It enables the Court to dismiss cases that are held to be "of minor importance", that is, those which do not require examination on the merits.

[Vokurka v. Czech Republic](#)

16.10.2007

New domestic remedy in respect of length-of-proceedings complaints recognised by the Court as "effective".

[Application declared inadmissible for non-exhaustion of domestic remedies.](#)

[Gratzinger and Gratzingerová v. Czech Republic and Poláček and Polácková v. Czech Republic](#)

29.05.2002

Applicants' inability, as United States nationals, to recover property confiscated by the former Czechoslovak Socialist Republic.

[Applications declared inadmissible.](#)

Noteworthy pending cases

Grand Chamber

Vavříčka v. the Czech Republic (no. 47621/13) and five other applications

The applications concern the Czech legislation on compulsory vaccination and its consequences for the applicants who refused to comply with it.

The applicants rely on a number of Articles of the Convention, in particular Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life) and Article 9 (freedom of thought, conscience and religion), and Article 2 of Protocol No. 1 (right to education).

On 17 December 2019 the Chamber to which these cases had been allocated [relinquished jurisdiction in favour of the Grand Chamber](#).

A Grand Chamber [hearing](#) took place at the Court on 1 July 2020

Schäfer v. the Czech Republic (no. 43861/13), Todorovič v. the Czech Republic (no. 43883/13), Lázók v. the Czech Republic (no. 43676/15), Barsegian v. the Czech Republic (no. 6261/16), Málek v. the Czech Republic (no. 32193/16), and Černín v. the Czech Republic (no. 32637/16)

Cases [communicated](#) to the Government on 16 February 2017

These cases concern the alleged unfairness of criminal proceedings conducted against the applicants with a primary focus on it not having been possible for them to question important witnesses in court.

The applicants rely on Article 6 §§ 1 and 3 (d) (the right to obtain the attendance and examination of witnesses) of the Convention.

Chamber

Inter-state case

Liechtenstein v. the Czech Republic (no. 35738/20)

The case concerns the respondent State's classification of Liechtenstein citizens as persons with German nationality for the purposes of applying the Decrees of the President of Republic of 1945 (also known as the Beneš decrees), which, among other things, confiscated property belonging to all ethnic Germans and Hungarians after the Second World War.

See [press release](#) published in August 2020.

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