EUROPEAN COURT OF HUMAN RIGHTS
COUR EUROPÉENNE DES DROITS DE L'HOMME

Press Unit
Unité de la Presse

Press country profile
Fiche pays pour la presse

Last updated: July 2026

Croatia

Ratified the European Convention on Human Rights in 1997

National Judge: Davor Derenčinović (10 January 2022 -)
Judges' CVs are available on the ECHR Internet site

Previous Judge: Nina Vajic (1998–2012) and Ksenija Turković (2013-2022)

List of judges of the Court since 1959

The Court dealt with 809 applications concerning Croatia in 2025, of which 794 were declared inadmissible or struck out. It delivered 13 judgments (concerning 15 applications), 12 of which found at least one violation of the European Convention on Human Rights.

Applications processed in	2024	2025	2026*
Applications allocated to a judicial formation	877	758	447
Communicated to Government	54	43	22
Applications decided:	1107	809	356
- Declared inadmissible or struck out (Single Judge)	1034	755	325
- Declared inadmissible or struck out (Committee)	42	35	22
- Declared inadmissible or struck out (Chamber)	8	4	2
- Decided by judgment	23	15	7

* January to July 2026

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 01/07/2026	
Applications pending before a judicial formation:	546
Single Judge	352
Committee (3 Judges)	164
Chamber (7 Judges)	30
Grand Chamber (17 Judges)	0

Croatia 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 **673** Registry staff members.

Noteworthy cases, judgments delivered

Grand Chamber

Inter-state case

Slovenia v. Croatia (no. 54155/16)

16.12.2020

The case concerned unpaid and overdue debts owed to Ljubljana Bank by various Croatian companies on the basis of loans granted at the time of the former Yugoslavia.

The Court declared that it did not have jurisdiction to hear the case.

Case concerning Article 3 (prohibition of inhuman or degrading treatment)

Muršić v. Croatia

20.10.2016

The case concerned the allegation that the applicant had a cell with insufficient personal space while he was held in Bjelovar Prison.

Violation of Article 3 for the period 18 July-13 August 2010, during which the applicant had less than 3 sq. m of personal space in Bjelovar Prison

No violation of Article 3 in respect of the other, non-consecutive, periods of detention during which he had less than 3 sq. m of personal space

No violation of Article 3 in respect of the periods in which he had personal space of between 3 sq. m and 4 sq. m in Bjelovar Prison.

The Court confirmed that 3 sq. m of surface area per detainee in a multi-occupancy cell was the prevalent norm in its case-law, being the applicable minimum standard for the purposes of Article 3. When that area fell below 3 sq. m, the lack of personal space was regarded as so serious that it gave rise to a strong presumption of a violation of Article 3.

Case concerning Article 4 (prohibition of slavery / prohibition of forced labour)

S.M. v. Croatia

25.06.2020

The case concerned a Croatian woman's complaint of human trafficking and forced prostitution.

Violation of Article 4

Cases concerning Article 6

Right to a fair trial

Mraović v. Croatia

09.04.2021

The case concerned the applicant's right to a public hearing in proceedings against him on charges of rape.

In view of the applicant's passing on 9 November 2020, the Government requested that the application be struck out of its list of cases. Given that no close relative wished to pursue the case, the Court considered that it was no longer justified to consider the application.

The Court decided to strike the application out of its list of cases.

Dvorski v. Croatia

20.10.2015

The case concerned the refusal by the police to allow a lawyer hired by the applicant's parents to represent him while he was being questioned at a police station on suspicion of multiple murder, armed robbery and arson. The applicant confessed to the offences after signing a power of attorney authorising another lawyer to represent him.

Violation of Article 6 §§ 1 and 3 (c) (right to legal assistance of one's own choosing)

Marguš v. Croatia

27.05.2014

The case concerned the conviction, in 2007, of a former commander of the Croatian army of war crimes against the civilian population committed in 1991. He complained in particular that his right to be tried by an impartial tribunal and to defend himself in person had been violated. Mr Marguš also alleged that the criminal offences of which he had been convicted were the same as those which had been the

subject of proceedings against him terminated in 1997 in application of the General Amnesty Act.
No violation of Article 6 §§ 1 and 3 (c)
The Court also decided that Article 4 of Protocol No. 7 (right not to be tried or punished twice) was not applicable in respect of the charges relating to the offences which had been the subject of proceedings against Mr Marguš terminated in 1997 in application of the General Amnesty Act.
At the same time, the Court declared inadmissible the complaint under Article 4 of Protocol No. 7 as regards Mr Marguš' right not to be tried or punished twice in respect of the charges dropped by the prosecutor in January 1996

Right to a fair trial within a reasonable time

Oršuš and Others v. Croatia
16.03.2010
Segregation of Roma children in Croatian primary schools found to be discriminatory.
Violation of Article 6 § 1
Violation of Article 14 (prohibition of discrimination) together with Article 2 of Protocol No. 1 (right to education)

Access to court

Zubac v. Croatia
05.04.2018
The case concerned the Croatian Supreme Court's refusal to consider an appeal on points of law in a property claim. The Supreme Court had refused to examine the appeal because the value of the subject matter of the dispute had been below the statutory threshold. The applicant, Ms Zubac, complained that she had therefore been prevented from having access to the Supreme Court.
No violation of Article 6 § 1

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

Radomilja and Others v. Croatia
20.03.2018
The case concerned the domestic courts' refusal to recognise the ownership of land the applicants' claimed to have acquired by adverse possession.
In June 2016 two Chamber judgments found a violation of the applicants' property rights, relying on the Court's case-law in an earlier case, *Trgo v. Croatia.*
The Grand Chamber held that before the Chamber the applicants had not relied on the period between 6 April 1941 and 8 October 1991, thus excluding it from the factual basis of their complaints. By taking that period into account the Chamber had decided beyond the scope of the case. The applicants were permitted to subsequently rely on that period before the Grand Chamber. **However, that amounted to raising a new complaint, which was inadmissible as it had been made outside the six-month time-limit.**
The Grand Chamber considered that the rest of the complaints made by the applicants were related to the domestic courts' application and interpretation of the law and their assessment of the facts.
Neither of those grounds allowed for their claims to be treated as possessions under the Convention, meaning that there had been **no violation of their property rights**.

Ališić and Others v. Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, Serbia, Slovenia and "The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia"
16.07.2014
Concerned the applicants' inability to recover "old" foreign-currency savings – deposited with two banks in what is now Bosnia and Herzegovina – following the dissolution of the former Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (SFRY).
Violation of Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 (protection of property) and of Article 13 (right to an effective remedy) by Serbia with regard to Mr Šahdanović
Violation of Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 and of Article 13 by Slovenia with regard to Ms Ališić and Mr Sadžak:
No violation of Article 1 of Protocol No.1 and of Article 13 with regard to the other respondent States
No violation of Article 14 taken together with Article 13 and Article 1 of Protocol No. 1

Blečić v. Croatia
08.03.2006
Termination of the applicant's specially protected tenancy (*stanarsko pravo*) during war in Croatia.

Unable to take cognisance of the merits of the application as the alleged interference with the applicant's property rights occurred before Croatia's ratification of the Convention

Chamber

Cases concerning inadequate investigations into war crimes during the Homeland war in Croatia (Article 2)

Violations of Article 2

B. and Others v. Croatia (no. 71593/11)
18.06.2015

Jelić v. Croatia
12.06.2014

Jularić v. Croatia and Skendžić and Krznarić v. Croatia
20.01.2011

Application inadmissible

Kušić and Others v. Croatia
16.01.2020
In their application to the European Court, the Kušić family alleged that the investigation into the death of their family members had been ineffective and that the domestic remedy suggested by the Government for their grievance, a constitutional complaint, was not effective as the Constitutional Court usually dismissed such complaints as unfounded.
The European Court concluded that the applicants had not exhausted domestic remedies, meaning that they had not given the State the opportunity to put matters right through its own legal system first. It therefore rejected the application as inadmissible.
The press release is also available in Croatian.

Other cases concerning the right to life (Article 2)

Violation of Article 2

Svrtan v. Croatia
03.12.2024

The case concerned the 12-year-old collateral victim in a shooting incident, amid widespread illegal possession of firearms in Croatia.

Daraibou v. Croatia (no. 84523/17)
17.01.2023
The case concerned a fire that broke out in the basement room of Bajakovo police station, which at the time had acted as an illegal-migrant detention centre. Three migrants detained in the room had died in the fire and the applicant, also a detained migrant, had suffered severe injuries.

M.H. and Others v. Croatia
18.11.2021
The case concerned the death of a six-year-old Afghan child, MAD.H., who was hit by a train after allegedly having been denied the opportunity to seek asylum by the Croatian authorities and ordered to return to Serbia via the tracks. It also concerned, in particular, the applicants' detention while seeking international protection.

Bljakaj and Others v. Croatia
18.09.2014
The case concerned a complaint that the authorities had failed to take the necessary measures to protect a lawyer who was shot dead by one of her clients' husband, who was mentally disturbed.

Branko Tomašić and Others v. Croatia
15.01.2009
Croatian authorities' failure to take adequate measures to protect applicants' relative and her child, who were killed by the child's father.

Cases concerning inhuman or degrading treatment (Article 3)

Violation of Article 3

Vučković v. Croatia (no. 15798/20)
12.12.2023
The case concerned the sexual assaults that Ms Vučković, a nurse, suffered at the hands of an ambulance driver colleague while working shifts together. Her assailant was sentenced to 10 months' imprisonment, but that sentence was commuted to community service on appeal.
Violations of Article 3
Violations of Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life)

J.I. v. Croatia (no. 35898/16)

08.09.2022

The case concerned a rape victim's complaint that the authorities had not taken seriously her allegation that her rapist – her father – had threatened to kill her during prison leave.

Sabalić v. Croatia

14.01.2021

The case concerned Ms Sabalić's allegation that the authorities' response to a violent homophobic attack against her had been inadequate. She had been attacked in a nightclub when she had refused a man's advances, disclosing to him that she was a lesbian.

Škorjanec v. Croatia

28.03.2017

The applicant complained to the European Court of Human Rights of a lack of an effective procedural response of the Croatian authorities in relation to a racially motivated act of violence against her.

M. and M. v. Croatia (no. 10161/13)

03.09.2015

The case concerned a custody dispute, including allegations of child abuse by the father. The applicants, a mother and her daughter, complained in particular that the national authorities had failed to remove the child from the father's care and to thus prevent further domestic abuse.

Đorđević v. Croatia

24.07.2012

The case concerned the complaint by a mother and her mentally and physically disabled son that they had been harassed, both physically and verbally, for over four years by children living in their neighbourhood, and that the authorities had failed to protect them.

V.D. v. Croatia (no. 15526/10)

08.11.2011

The case concerned the complaint by a schizophrenic that the police ill-treated him while trying to arrest him.

Đurđević v. Croatia

19.07.2011

The case concerned complaints by three members of a family of Roma origin about their ill-treatment by private individuals, by the police and at the son's school.

The Court further found that the boy's complaints of bullying at school should have been more specific to be admissible.

Mader v. Croatia

21.06.2011

Ill-treatment – lack of food and sleep - and lack of legal assistance during applicant's police interrogation on murder charges.

This is the first case against Croatia concerning alleged lack of legal assistance during police questioning.

Šečić v. Croatia

31.05.2007

Failure of domestic authorities to undertake a serious and thorough investigation into a racist attack against applicant, most probably induced by ethnic hatred.

No Violation of Article 3

A and B v. Croatia (no. 7144/15)

20.06.2019

The case concerned a complaint that the Croatian authorities had failed to provide a proper response to allegations of child sexual abuse.

Cases concerning Article 5 (right to liberty and security)

Miklić v. Croatia (no. 41023/19)

07.04.2022

The case concerned Mr Miklić's placement in a psychiatric institution after his conviction on charges of intrusive and threatening behaviour committed as a minor and while lacking mental capacity.

Violation of Article 5 § 1

Čutura v. Croatia

10.01.2019

The case concerned a court order to keep the applicant in a psychiatric hospital where he had been placed after it had been found in the criminal proceedings that he had uttered threats in a state of mental derangement.

Violations of Article 5 § 1

Oravec v. Croatia

11.07.2017

The case concerned a decision ordering the detention of the applicant, Mr Oravec. The applicant was arrested and detained in April 2011 on suspicion of drug trafficking, and later released by the investigating judge. While at liberty, the prosecutor successfully

appealed against the decision to release him and, in June 2011, Mr Oravec was ordered to be re-arrested and placed in detention. The prosecution ultimately dropped the charges against him.
No violation of Article 5 § 1 as concerned the lawfulness of the detention order of June 2011

Peša v. Croatia

08.04.2010
Case (widely referred to as the "Maestro" affair) concerned Vice-president of the Croatian Privatisation Fund's complaint in particular about the duration of his detention as well as the proceedings concerning its lawfulness following his arrest and remand in custody on suspicion of taking bribes. He further complained about statements made to the media on his case by high-ranking State officials.
Violations of Article 5 §§ 3 and 4
Violation of Article 6 § 2 (presumption of innocence)

Cases concerning Article 6

Right to a fair trial

Violation of Article 6 § 1

Mlinarević v. Croatia (no. 24406/21) and Sanader v. Croatia (no. 27577/21)

30.04.2026
The cases of Mr Mlinarević and Mr Sanader v. Croatia concerned criminal proceedings for corruption widely referred to as the "Planinska" affair. The accused in the proceedings, Mladen Mlinarević and Ivo Sanader, former Prime Minister of Croatia, alleged that the judge who had presided over their cases before the Constitutional Court had been biased.

Mr Sanader's application was declared inadmissible.

Baljak and Others v. Croatia

25.11.2021
The case concerned the domestic courts' dismissal of the applicants' claim for damages against the State on the grounds that they had failed to prove that the State was responsible for the death of their relative, despite the fact that he had been detained by Croatian soldiers and taken to an unknown location, with his body being found years later in a mass grave with a gunshot wound to the head.

Hodžić v. Croatia

04.04.2019
The case concerned the proceedings for the applicant's confinement in a psychiatric hospital.

Matanović v. Croatia

04.04.2017
Mr Matanović, the applicant, a vice-president of the Croatian Privatisation Fund, was convicted of corruption in 2009 for accepting and facilitating bribes in exchange for support of investment projects and privatisations. His conviction was essentially based on evidence obtained via telephone tapping following a covert operation involving an informant.

Sanader v. Croatia

12.02.2015
The case essentially concerned the complaint by a man convicted in his absence of war crimes – committed in 1991 as a participant in Serb paramilitary forces – that he was unable to obtain a rehearing of his case.

Zagrebačka banka d.d. v. Croatia

12.12.2013
Concerned enforcement proceedings against the applicant bank in which the main issue was the exact calculation of the statutory default interest on the principal sum the bank had been ordered to pay in preceding civil proceedings against it. This resulted in the seizure of over 168,000,000 Croatian Kunas from its account.

Ajdarić v. Croatia

13.12.2011
Concerned a man convicted of three murders and sentenced to 40 years' imprisonment solely on the basis of hearsay evidence.

X and Y v. Croatia (no. 5193/09)

03.11.2011
The case concerned proceedings brought by the social services to divest a mother (X) and a daughter (Y) of their legal capacity.

Juričić v. Croatia

26.07.2011
Complaint brought by a candidate for the judge of the Constitutional Court about the alleged unfairness of proceedings in which

she had contested a decision of Croatian Parliament to appoint another candidate and not her.

Lisica v. Croatia

25.02.2010

Applicants' conviction for bank robbery based on evidence obtained without their knowledge.

Mežnarić v. Croatia

15.07.2005

Decision with regard to the applicant's constitutional complaint concerning a breach of contract decided by a panel of judges which included a judge who had represented his opponents at an earlier stage in the proceedings.

No violation of Article 6 § 1

Tadić v. Croatia (no. 25551/18)

28.11.2023

The case concerned criminal proceedings in which Mr Tadić had been found guilty of conspiring – through payments of money – to influence the Supreme Court to give a decision favourable to a well-known politician who was being tried for a war crime.

No violation of Article 6 §§ 1 and 2 (right to a fair trial)

Galović v. Croatia

31.08.2021

The case concerned the applicant's convictions for domestic violence in several sets of minor-offence proceedings and in criminal proceedings on indictment.

No violation of Article 6 §§ 1 and 3 (b) and (c) (right to a fair trial) as regards the time the applicant had had to prepare his defence before an appeal court session on his case

Violation of Article 6 §§ 1 and 3 (c) of the Convention as regards the applicant's absence from the appeal court session

No violation of Article 4 of Protocol No. 7 (right not to be tried or punished twice)

Vujnović v. Croatia

11.06.2020

The case essentially concerned the civil proceedings for damages following the death of the applicant's parents during a military operation by the Croatian army in 1993. The applicant's claim was ultimately dismissed as statute-barred.

Jureša v. Croatia

22.05.2018

The case concerned Ms Jureša's complaint that she had not been allowed to appeal to the Supreme Court in a property inheritance dispute.

The Court observed that the Supreme Court had declared Ms Jureša's appeal on points of law inadmissible because the value of the dispute had not reached the necessary legal threshold. That decision had been a reversal of previous Supreme Court case-law on such issues.

Matanović v. Croatia

04.04.2017

(see above)

Right to a fair trial within a reasonable time

Violation of Article 6 § 1

Kirinčić and Others v. Croatia

30.07.2020

The case concerned complaints about violations of the right to a fair trial within a reasonable time and the lack of effective domestic remedies for such complaints.

See also Glavinić and Marković v. Croatia

No violation of Article 6 § 1

Olujić v. Croatia

05.02.2009

Unfairness of disciplinary proceedings against applicant, former judge and President of the Supreme Court (*Vrhovni sud Republike Hrvatske*) before his dismissal in 1998.

Right of access to court

Momčilović v. Croatia

26.03.2015

The case concerned the condition in Croatian law making access to a civil court dependent on a prior attempt to settle the claim.

No violation of Article 6 § 1

Cases concerning Article 7 (no punishment without law)

Milanković v. Croatia (no. 33351/20)

20.01.2022

The case concerned the applicant's conviction for war crimes, perpetrated by the police units under his command,

against the Serbian civilian population and a prisoner of war, on the territory of Croatia between mid-August 1991 and mid-June 1992. The applicant complained that, in convicting him of those crimes, the domestic courts had applied a protocol applicable only to international armed conflicts, whereas the events had taken place before Croatian independence and thus during a non-international armed conflict.
No violation of Article 7

Cases concerning private and family life (Article 8)

Violation of Article 8

Petrović and Others v. Croatia
14.01.2025
The case concerned three mothers' suspicions that their new-born children, born between 1986 and 1994, had not become ill and died, as the State-run hospitals alleged, but had been abducted and unlawfully given up for adoption.

Mile Novaković v. Croatia
17.12.2020
The case concerned a teacher's complaint about being dismissed in 1999 for giving his classes in Serbian rather than in Croatian. Of Serb ethnicity, he had lived and worked in Croatia for most of his professional life and at the time of his dismissal was working at a secondary school in Eastern Slavonia, in an area which had been peacefully reintegrated into Croatian territory after the war. The authorities held in particular that he could not be expected to learn Croatian, given that he was 55 years old at the time.

Hoti v. Croatia
26.04.2018
The case concerned a migrant in Croatia who complained that he had been unable to regularise his residence status since his arrival in the country in 1979. His parents fled Albania in 1960 as political refugees and settled in Kosovo; he was born there a few years later. He has since been told by the Albanian authorities that he is not Albanian; according to his birth certificate, he has no nationality. He has been living and intermittently working in Croatia for almost 40 years and has no link with any other country as he has, in the meantime, lost contact with all his relatives. Currently unemployed because he has no residence status, he survives by carrying out occasional work on farms.

Vujica v. Croatia
08.10.2015
The case essentially concerned two parallel sets of proceedings in which the Croatian courts had refused to return Ms Vujica's three children to her in Austria and had awarded custody to the father.

Dragojević v. Croatia
15.01.2015
The case principally concerned the secret surveillance of telephone conversations of a drug-trafficking suspect.

Marić v. Croatia
12.06.2014
The case concerned the disposal of a stillborn child as clinical waste by a publicly-owned hospital and the father's complaint that he was then unable to obtain information about the resting place of his child.

Brežec v. Croatia
18.07.2013
The case concerned the applicant's complaint that she was evicted from a flat in which she had lived for 32 years following a domestic court's order.

M.S. v. Croatia (no. 36337/10)
25.04.2013
The case originated in a dispute between, on the one hand, two sisters (one of whom is the applicant, Ms M.S.) and, on the other hand, the owner and employee of the restaurant above which they live, resulting in them bringing criminal proceedings against one another and Ms M.S. being appointed a guardian in proceedings to divest her of her legal capacity. The applicant notably brought criminal proceedings against the employee of the restaurant for allegedly hitting and kicking her in May 2003; and, the restaurant owner brought proceedings in August 2006 against the applicant and her sister for defamation.

A.K. and L.K. v. Croatia (no. 37956/11)
08.01.2013
Concerned mother with mild mental disability divested of her parental rights. Her son was put up for adoption without her knowledge, consent or participation in the adoption proceedings.

Orlić v. Croatia
21.06.2011
Concerned the eviction of a retired military serviceman from a flat which had been allocated to him by the former Yugoslav People's Army (the YPA), after Croatia had issued a global ban in July 1991 on transactions concerning YPA property in the country.

Krušković v. Croatia
21.06.2011
Father deprived of legal capacity left in legal void as concerned his paternity rights – first case concerning recognition of paternity of a father who had lost legal capacity.

A. v. Croatia (no. 55164/08)
14.10.2010
Case concerned the authorities' failure to protect applicant against domestic violence of her mentally-ill ex-husband.

Oluić v. Croatia
20.05.2010
Croatian authorities' failure to protect applicant from excessive noise coming from a bar adjoined to her house.

Janković v. Croatia
05.03.2009
Authorities' failure to adequately protect applicant from being attacked by her flatmates and subsequently to have them punished.

X v. Croatia (no. 11223/04)
17.07.2008
Applicant, a paranoid schizophrenic divested of her capacity to act, complained about daughter being given up for adoption without her knowledge or consent.

Karadžić v. Croatia
15.12.2005
Inefficiency of Croatian authorities in enforcing a court order to reunite applicant with her son, kidnapped by the boy's father.

Mikulic v. Croatia
07.02.2002
Inefficiency of domestic courts with regard to applicant's paternity suit left her in state of prolonged uncertainty as to personal identity.

No violation of Article 8

Mesić v. Croatia (no. 2) (no. 45066/17)
30.05.2023
The case concerned an article published in February 2015 by an Internet news portal Dnevno.hr suggesting that the applicant, a former President of Croatia, had, during his term of office, been offered or taken bribes in relation to the procurement of armoured vehicles for the Croatian army from the Finnish company Patria. Mr Mesić complained that by dismissing his civil action for compensation, the domestic courts had failed to protect his reputation in violation of his right to respect for private life.

A and B v. Croatia (no. 7144/15)
20.06.2019
The case concerned a complaint that the Croatian authorities had failed to provide a proper response to allegations of child sexual abuse.

Pojatina v. Croatia
04.10.2018
The case concerned Croatian legislation on home births. The applicant is a mother who gave birth to her fourth child at home with the help of a midwife from abroad. She alleged in particular that, although Croatian law allowed home births, women such as her could not make this choice in practice because they were not able to get professional help.

Cases concerning freedom of thought, conscience, and religion (Article 9)

Savez Crkava Riječ Života and Others v. Croatia
09.12.2010
Concerned discrimination against Reformist churches. Applicant churches complained that, unlike other religious communities in Croatia, they could not provide religious

education in public schools and nurseries or obtain official recognition of their religious marriages as the domestic authorities refused to conclude an agreement with them regulating their legal status.
Violation of Article 9 in conjunction with Article 14 (prohibition of discrimination)

Freedom of expression cases (Article 10)

Violation of Article 10

Miljević v. Croatia
25.06.2020
The case concerned the applicant's conviction for defamation following statements he had made in his defence in another set of proceedings against him for war crimes. In particular, in his closing arguments, he had accused a retired colonel in the Croatian army, a third party who had no role in the war crime proceedings, of witness tampering.

Narodni List D.D. v. Croatia
08.11.2018
The case concerned the freedom of the press to criticise judges. The applicant, the publisher of a weekly magazine, complained about a domestic court decision finding that it had defamed a county court judge and ordering it to pay over 6,000 euros in damages. The decision referred to an article the applicant had published criticising the judge for going to a party despite a potential conflict of interest and for issuing an unjustified search warrant of its premises.

Stojanović v. Croatia
19.09.2013
The case concerned defamation proceedings brought by the Croatian Minister of Health against Mr Stojanović following the publication of two articles in 1997 reproducing critical statements attributed to the latter – which he denied having made – resulting in Mr Stojanović being ordered to pay damages to the minister.
The Court rejected an objection by the Croatian Government to the effect that Article 10 was not applicable. It underlined that the extent of liability in defamation must not go beyond a person's own words, and that an individual may not be held responsible for statements or allegations made by others.

No violation of Article 10

Mesić v. Croatia (no. 19362/18)
05.05.2022
The case concerned civil proceedings for defamation in which the applicant – a former President of Croatia – had been ordered by the Croatian courts to pay the equivalent of 6,660 euros (EUR) to a specialist lawyer of Croatian origin practising in France, for having tarnished his reputation.
The Court found a violation of Article 6 § 1 (right to a fair hearing within a reasonable time)

Šeks v. Croatia (no. 39325/20)
03.02.2022
The case concerned a retired politician's complaint that his request for access to classified presidential records in order to carry out research for a book had been denied on national security grounds.

Europapress holding d.o.o. v. Croatia (no. 25333/06)
22.10.2009
Defamation proceedings against the applicant, a newspaper publisher, for reporting in an article that B.Š., at the time Minister of Finance, had pointed a gun at a journalist.

Freedom of assembly and association (Article 11)

Vlahov v. Croatia (no. 31163/13)
05.05.2022
The case concerned the right of trade unions to control their membership *vis-à-vis* the right to freedom of association of would-be members. The applicant, a trade-union representative, complained that he had been convicted in 2010 of preventing 15 would-be members from joining his union.
Violation of Article 11

Cases dealing with discrimination (Article 14)

Jurčić v. Croatia

04.02.2021

The case concerned the denial to the applicant of employment health-insurance coverage during pregnancy. The authorities had claimed that her recently signed employment contract had been fictitious, and that she should not have started work in any case while undergoing in vitro fertilisation.

Violation of Article 14 read in conjunction with Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 (protection of property)

Guberina v. Croatia

22.03.2016

The case concerned the complaint by the father of a severely handicapped child about the tax authorities' failure to take account of the needs of his child when determining his eligibility for tax exemption on the purchase of property adapted to his child's needs.

Violation of Article 14 in conjunction with Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 (protection of property)

Pajić v. Croatia

23.02.2016

The case concerned the complaint by a national of Bosnia and Herzegovina, who is in a stable same-sex relationship with a woman living in Croatia, of having been discriminated against on the grounds of her sexual orientation when applying for a residence permit in Croatia.

Violation of Article 14 taken in conjunction with Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life)

Cases concerning property issues (Article 1 of Protocol No. 1)

Violation of Article 1 of Protocol No. 1

Zaklan v. Croatia

16.12.2021

The case concerned attempts by the applicant to recover foreign currency seized by the Yugoslav authorities in 1991 in Croatia when that State had still been part of Yugoslavia.

Čakarević v. Croatia

26.04.2018

The case concerned the applicant's complaint that she had been ordered to repay unemployment benefits after the employment office made a mistake in authorising the payments.

The Court observed that Ms Čakarević, who was unemployed and suffered from ill health, had done nothing to mislead the employment office about her circumstances.

Petar Matas v. Croatia

04.10.2016

The case concerned the Croatian authorities' decision to restrict Mr Matas' use of a building he owned and used as a car repair workshop pending an evaluation of its cultural value.

S.L. and J.L. v. Croatia (no. 13712/11)

07.05.2015

The case concerned the state's protection of the interests of the applicants, who were minors at the time of the facts, in a property deal.

Statileo v. Croatia

10.07.2014

The case concerned legislation introduced in 1996 to reform the housing sector in Croatia. The applicant, Mr Statileo, who was the landlord of a flat which was formerly part of a specially protected tenancy scheme under the Socialist regime, complained in particular that, under the new legislation, he was unable to use his flat, rent it to the person of his choice or charge the market rent for its lease.

Lelas v. Croatia

20.05.2010

Croatia's refusal to pay the applicant, a military serviceman, a special allowance for demining work.

Trgo v. Croatia

11.06.2009

Refusal of domestic courts to acknowledge applicant's ownership of certain plots of land acquired by adverse possession.

No violation of Article 1 of Protocol No. 1

Bikić v. Croatia

29.05.2018

The case concerned the authorities' refusal to let an employee of a socially owned

company buy a flat in Zagreb where she had been living for 30 years. She moved into the property under the former Yugoslav socialist regime when employees of socially owned companies were put on lists for the distribution of flats paid for by employee contributions. Those who obtained a flat acquired what was called a "specially protected tenancy". Parliament abolished those tenancies in 1991 and a new law regulated the sale of flats previously let under the protected tenancy system.

Right not to be tried or punished twice (Article 4 § 1 of Protocol No. 7)

Bajčić v. Croatia

08.10.2020

The case concerned the applicant's complaint that he had been tried and punished twice for the same driving offence. In particular, he had first been convicted in minor offence proceedings for speeding and later on in criminal proceedings for causing a fatal road accident. He was fined in the first set of proceedings and given a prison sentence in the second.

No violation of Article 4 § 1 of Protocol No. 7

Noteworthy cases, decisions delivered

Article 2 (right to life)
Cases concerning allegations of killings of civilians by Croatian soldiers during the homeland war in Croatia

Bekić and Others v. Croatia

30.09.2014

Applications declared inadmissible as lodged out of time in accordance with Article 35 §§ 1 and 4 of the Convention

Paić and Others v. Croatia
Schubert Tepšić and Tepšić v. Croatia

12.11.2013

Applications struck out of the Court's list of cases following a friendly settlement agreement between the applicants and the Croatian Government

Article 6 § 1 (right to a fair hearing)

Ljubljanska banka d.d. v. Croatia

12.05.2015

The case essentially concerned the enforcement proceedings brought by the Ljubljanska banka d.d. against a Croatian sugar factory for recovery of debt. The bank complained in particular about the non-enforcement of two writs of execution in its favour.

Application declared inadmissible as Ljubljanska banka had no standing to lodge an individual application before the European Court.

Article 7 (no punishment without law)

Chelleri and Others v. Croatia (nos. 49358/22, 49562/22 and 54489/22)

16.05.2024

The case concerned the applicants' (all fishermen) convictions for minor offences by the Croatian courts for activities in maritime waters claimed both by Croatia and Slovenia.

Application declared inadmissible.

Articles 9 (freedom of thought, conscience, and religion) and Article 10 (freedom of expression)

Balenović v. Croatia

30.09.2010

Applicant's dismissal from INA – Industrija nafte d.d, Croatia's national oil company, because she had made statements to the press about irregularities in the operation of the company.

Application declared inadmissible as manifestly ill-founded.

Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 (protection of property)

Šubašić v. Croatia

30.03.2010

Refusal of the Croatian authorities to reimburse the applicant for urgent post-natal medical care of her twin daughters, born prematurely in a hospital abroad.

Application declared inadmissible for non-exhaustion of domestic remedies.

Article 2 of Protocol No. 4 (freedom of movement)

Hernádi v. Croatia

26.09.2019

The case concerned the Croatian authorities' efforts to question Zsolt Tamás Hernádi, who is the Chairman and Chief Executive Officer of the Hungarian national oil and gas company MOL, in connection with criminal proceedings against him and the former Croatian Prime Minister for bribery. Neither a detention order nor European arrest warrants have resulted in the CEO's surrender to the Croatian authorities.

Application declared inadmissible for non-exhaustion of domestic remedies.

Article 4 of Protocol No. 7 (right not to be tried or punished twice)

Matijašić v. Croatia

01.07.2021

The applicant complained that his prosecution and punishment for minor road traffic offences, and the subsequent application of a driving ban on account of the same offences, had violated the Convention.

Application declared inadmissible

Seražin v. Croatia

08.11.2018

The case concerned the measures used in Croatia to fight against hooliganism.

Application declared inadmissible

Noteworthy pending cases

Mikecin Misetic v. Croatia (no. 36780/23) and 4 other applications

Case communicated to the Government in February 2026

Concerns the election of Constitutional Court judges by the Croatian Parliament in 2016.

Sanader v. Croatia (no. 2001/23)
Hernádi v. Croatia (no. 31914/23)

Case communicated to the Government in September 2025

Concerns criminal proceedings conducted against the applicants on charges of bribery in relation to agreements concluded in January 2009 between the Croatian Government and a Hungarian oil and gas company MOL.

Krušlin v. Croatia (no. 13651/23)

Case communicated to the Government in April 2025

Concerns disciplinary proceedings against a former judge.

Buhin v. Croatia (no. 20538/24)

Case communicated to the Government in February 2025

Concerns access to the Constitutional Court following a change in practice for appeals on points of law.

Article 6 § 1 (right to a fair trial)

Golomejić v. Croatia (no. 9461/24)

Case communicated to the Government in December 2024

Concerns the abolition of a benefit for child-rearing parents (*roditelji odgojitelji*).

Articles 6 (right to a fair trial) and 8 (right to respect for private and family life) and Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 (protection of property)

Đinić v. Croatia (no. 31052/22)

Case communicated to the Government in March 2024

Concerns refusal of applicants' request to change their ethnicity in the birth register.

Article 8 (right to respect for private life)

Q v. Croatia (no. 38496/21)

Case communicated to the Government in October 2022

Concerns Croatian authorities' decisions not to open a criminal investigation against the applicant's father on charges of physical abuse.

S.B. v. Croatia (no. 18810/19)
A.A. v. Croatia (no. 18865/19)
A.B. v. Croatia (no. 23495/19)

Cases communicated to the Government in March 2020

Concerns complaints brought by Syrian nationals about their alleged summary removals from Croatia to Bosnia and Herzegovina.

In particular Article 3 (prohibition of inhuman and degrading treatment), Article 13 (right to an effective remedy) and Article 4 of Protocol No. 4 (prohibition of collective expulsion of aliens)

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