



Last updated: October 2021

# Slovakia

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

**National Judge: Alena Poláčková (2015-2024)**

[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 281 applications concerning Slovakia in 2020, of which 268 were declared inadmissible or struck out. It delivered 12 judgments (concerning 13 applications), 10 of which found at least one violation of the European Convention on Human Rights.

Applications processed in	2019	2020	2021*
Applications allocated to a judicial formation	300	289	226
Communicated to the Government	55	70	18
Applications decided:	304	281	224
- Declared inadmissible or struck out (Single Judge)	263	252	187
- Declared inadmissible or struck out (Committee)	33	16	29
- Declared inadmissible or struck out (Chamber)	1	0	0
- Decided by judgment	7	13	8

\* January to July 2021

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 01/07/2021	
Applications pending before a judicial formation:	152
Single Judge	48
Committee (3 Judges)	46
Chamber (7 Judges)	58
Grand Chamber (17 Judges)	0

## 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 **624** 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)**

#### [Shiksaitov v. Slovakia](#)

10.12.2020

The case concerned the alleged unlawfulness of the applicant's arrest and

detention with a view to his extradition to Russia, despite his having refugee status in Sweden.

[Violation of Article 5 § 1 \(right to liberty and security\) and 5 § 5 \(enforceable right to compensation\)](#)

#### [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)

#### [M.L. v. Slovakia](#)

14.10.2021

The case concerned three 2006 newspaper articles about the applicant's son – a former parish priest – after his passing, and the ensuing court proceedings. The articles had combined certain elements from the criminal case files of the applicant's son's convictions with frivolous and unverified statements, in particular around the man's death and alleged confessions.

[Violation of 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 \(no. 4\)](#)**

23.09.2021

The case concerned a television programme in which a famous singer allegedly expressed support for marijuana legalisation and the journalist allegedly appeared to agree with him resulting in the broadcaster being fined.

[Violation of 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](#)

**Prohibition of collective expulsion of  
aliens**

**(Article 4 of Protocol No. 4)**

**[Asady and Others v. Slovakia](#)**

24.03.2020

The case concerned the applicants' expulsion to Ukraine by the Slovakian police.

[No violation of Article 4 of Protocol No. 4](#)

**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

---

**Request for an advisory opinion under Protocol No. 16 to the Convention**

On 19 November 2020, the European Court of Human Rights decided not to accept a request (no. P16-2020-001) for an advisory opinion submitted by the Supreme Court of Slovakia.

The request was [rejected](#) because the question raised did not concern an issue on which the requesting court would need the Court's guidance to be able to ensure respect for Convention rights when determining the case pending before it.

**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.

**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.