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

Denmark

Ratified the European Convention on Human Rights in 1953

National Judge: Anne Louise Bormann (13 April 2023 –)
Judges' CVs are available on the ECHR Internet site

Previous Judges: Alf Niels Christian Ross (1959-1971), Helga Pedersen (1971-1980), Max Sørensen (1980-1981), Jørgen Gersing (1982-1988), Isi Foighel (1989-1998), Peer Lorenzen (1998-2014), Jon Fridrik Kjølbro (2014–2022)

List of judges of the Court since 1959

The Court dealt with 95 applications concerning Denmark in 2025, of which 90 were declared inadmissible or struck out. It delivered 5 judgments (concerning 5 applications), 2 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	66	92	59
Communicated to the Government	9	6	4
Applications decided:	75	95	47
- Declared inadmissible or struck out (Single Judge)	55	86	44
- Declared inadmissible or struck out (Committee)	9	4	1
- Declared inadmissible or struck out (Chamber)	2	0	0
- Decided by judgment	9	5	2

* 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:	32
Single Judge	11
Committee (3 Judges)	2
Chamber (7 Judges)	17
Grand Chamber (17 Judges)	2

Denmark 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

Savran v. Denmark

07.12.2021

The case concerned a Turkish national who had been resident in Denmark for most of his life. He was deported in 2015 following a 2008 expulsion order given for violent crimes he had committed in the 2000s.

No violation of Article 3 (prohibition on inhuman and degrading treatment)

Violation of Article 8 (right to respect for private life)

M.A. v. Denmark

09.07.2021

The case concerned a delay of three years imposed in 2016 pursuant to Danish law on the applicant's right to family reunification owing to his temporary protection status.

Violation of Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life)

S., V. and A. v. Denmark

22.10.2018

The case concerned the applicants' detention on 10 October 2009 for over seven hours when they were in Copenhagen to watch a football match between Denmark and Sweden. The authorities detained the applicants in order to prevent hooligan violence. The applicants unsuccessfully sought compensation before the Danish courts.

No violation of Article 5 § 1 (right to liberty and security)

The Court was satisfied that the Danish courts had struck the right balance between the applicants' right to liberty and the importance of preventing hooliganism.

Biao v. Denmark

24.05.2016

The case concerned the complaint by a naturalised Danish citizen of Togolese origin, Ousmane Biao, and his Ghanaian wife that they could not settle in Denmark. Notably, the Danish authorities refused to grant them family reunion as the couple did not comply with the requirement under the relevant domestic law (the Aliens Act) that they must not have stronger ties with another country, Ghana in their case, than with Denmark (known as the "attachment requirement"). The applicants also complained that an amendment to the Aliens Act in December 2003 – lifting the attachment requirement for those who held Danish citizenship for at least 28 years – resulted in a difference in treatment between those born Danish nationals and those, like Mr Biao, who had acquired Danish citizenship later in life.

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

The Court further held that there was no need to examine the application separately under Article 8 of the Convention taken alone.

Sorensen & Rasmussen v. Denmark

11.01.2006

Concerned the applicants' complaint about closed-shop agreements in Denmark.

Violation of Article 11 (freedom of association)

Freedom of expression cases (Article 10)

Pedersen and Baadsgaard v. Denmark

17.12.2004

Conviction for defamation of the applicants, journalists, for programmes concerning the police's handling of a murder case.

No violation of Article 6 (right to a fair trial within a reasonable time)

No violation of Article 10

Jersild v. Denmark

23.09.1994

Conviction of a journalist for aiding and abetting the dissemination of racist remarks through an interview on national television of the "Green jackets" (an extremist youth group).

Violation of Article 10

Chamber

Case concerning the right to life (Article 2)

Kalkan v. Denmark

27.05.2025

The case concerned the applicant's son's death in prison from a heart attack after

having been restrained in a prone position leg lock.
Violation of Article 2 in respect of the State's duty to give prison guards instructions and training on the use of the prone position

Rasmussen and Others v. Denmark
25.11.2025
Accidental death of a prisoner caused by a drug overdose
No violation of Article 2

Cases on prohibition of inhuman or degrading treatment (Article 3)

Daugaard Sorensen v. Denmark
15.10.2024
The case concerned the withdrawal of charges against the applicant's alleged rapist, in view of errors that had occurred at the Regional State Prosecutor's Office, in particular a failure to comply with a statutory time-limit.
Violations of Articles 3 and 8

El-Asmar v. Denmark
03.10.202
The case concerned the applicant's being pepper sprayed by two guards while held in an observational cell in prison in April 2017.
Volation of Article 3 as regards the allegation of excessive use of force and
a further violation of Article 3 concerning the lack of an effective investigation

Aggerholm v. Denmark
15.09.2020
The case concerned a complaint by a schizophrenic man about being strapped to a restraint bed in a psychiatric hospital for nearly 23 hours, one of the longest periods of such immobilisation ever examined by the European Court.
Violation of Article 3

T.N. v. Denmark
T.N. and S.N. v. Denmark
S.S. and Others v. Denmark
P.K. v. Denmark
and
N.S. v. Denmark
20.01.2010
The five cases concerned applications from nine Tamils claiming they risked persecution and ill-treatment by the authorities &/or the "Tamil Tigers" if deported from Denmark to Sri Lanka.
No violation of Article 3 if orders to deport the applicants to Sri Lanka were to be implemented.

Cases concerning the right to liberty and security (Article 5)

Vasileva v. Denmark
25.09.2003
Concerned the detention in police custody overnight of the applicant, a 67-year-old woman in poor health, after she had had a dispute with a ticket collector on public transport and refused to disclose her identity.
Violation of Article 5 § 1

Cases dealing with Article 6

Right to a fair trial

Abdulaal Naser and Others v. Denmark (application no. 46571/22)
21.10.2025
The case concerned a military search and arrest operation on 25 November 2004 in Az Zubayr, outside Basra (Iraq). Danish Military forces had participated in the operation at the request of the Iraqi authorities.
No violation of Article 6

Hauschildt v. Denmark
24.05.1989
Concerned the impartiality of tribunals which had convicted the applicant, where certain of the judges involved had also made pre-trial decisions ordering his detention on remand (Administration of Justice Act was subsequently amended).
Violation of Article 6

Right to a fair hearing/trial within a reasonable time

Length of civil proceedings cases:

Valentin v. Denmark
26.03.2009
Violation of Articles 6 (right to a fair trial within a reasonable time) and 13 (right to an effective remedy) and Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 (protection of property)

Christensen v. Denmark
22.01.2009
Violation of Articles 6 and 13

Iversen v. Denmark
28.09.2006
Violation of Article 6 §1

Kurt Nielsen v. Denmark
15.02.2000
Violation of Article 6 § 1

A and Others v. Denmark
08.02.1996
Violation of Article 6

Length of criminal proceedings in "tax asset stripping" cases ("*selskabstmmersager*"):

Hasslund v. Denmark
11.12.2008

Moesgaard Petersen v. Denmark
11.12.2008
Violations of Article 6 § 1 (right to fair trial within a reasonable time)

Cases concerning no punishment without law (Article 7)

Mørck Jensen v. Denmark
18.10.2022
The case concerned a Danish citizen's conviction for a stay in a conflict zone in an area of Syria where the Danish State had restricted travel.
No violation of Article 7
No violation of Article 2 of Protocol No. 4 (freedom of movement)

Custers, Deveaux and Turk v. Denmark
03.05.2007
Members of Greenpeace complained about their conviction by the Danish courts of trespassing for taking part in a campaign in 2001 near the American "Thule Air Base" in North-West Greenland (an act which they alleged, at the time it had been committed, had not amounted to a criminal offence under Danish law).
No violation of Article 7

Cases concerning private and family life (Article 8)

K.K. and Others v. Denmark
06.12.2022
The case concerned the refusal to allow the applicant K.K. to adopt the applicants C1 and C2 (twins) as a "stepmother" in Denmark. The twins were born to a surrogate mother in Ukraine who was paid for her service under a contract concluded with K.K. and her partner, the biological father of the children. Under Danish law, adoption was not permitted in cases where payment had been made to the person who had to consent to the adoption.
No violation of Article 8 - finding in particular that there had been no damage to the family life of the applicants, who lived together with the children's father unproblematically
No violation of Article 8 as regards the mother's right to respect for her private life as the domestic authorities had been correct in ruling so, in order to protect the public interest in controlling paid surrogacy, over K.K.'s Article 8 rights
Violation of Article 8 as regards the right to respect for the private lives of the two applicant children. The Danish authorities had failed to strike a balance between the interests of the children and the societal interests in limiting the negative effects of commercial surrogacy, in particular as regards their legal situation and legal relationship to K.K.

Munir Johana v. Denmark
and
Khan v. Denmark
12.01.2021
The cases concerned the applicants' expulsions from Denmark being ordered following repeated convictions for various criminal offences, despite their having lived there since a young age.
No violations of Article 8

Levakovic v. Denmark
23.10.2018
The case concerned a decision to expel the applicant to Croatia, with which he had no ties apart from nationality, after he was tried and convicted for crimes committed in

Denmark, where he had lived most of his life.
No violation of Article 8

Assem Hassan Ali v. Denmark
23.10.2018
The case concerned the expulsion from Denmark of a Jordanian national, who has six children of Danish nationality. He was deported in 2014 following convictions for drugs offences.
No violation of Article 8

Osman v. Denmark
14.06.2011
The case concerned the refusal to renew the Danish residence permit of a Somali girl, who had grown up with her family in Denmark, after she spent more than two years, allegedly against her will, living in Kenya. The right to family reunification for young people of her age (15-17) in Denmark was abolished while she was away.
Violation of Article 8

Amrollahi v. Denmark
11.07.2002
Impossibility for an Iranian citizen, convicted in Denmark of drugs offences and ordered to be expulsed with a life-long ban on his return, to continue his family life with his Danish wife and child outside Denmark.
Violation of Article 8 if the decision to expel the applicant to Iran were to be implemented

Inadmissible applications

Johansen v. Denmark (no. 27801/19)
03.03.2022
The case concerned the stripping of the applicant's Danish nationality following his conviction in 2017 for terrorism offences, in particular for having gone to Syria to join the "Islamic State". The authorities also ordered his deportation from Denmark with a permanent ban on his return.
Application declared inadmissible for being manifestly ill-founded

Alam v. Denmark
29.06.2017
The application concerned an expulsion and life-long ban of a Pakistani national from Denmark. In 2013 Ms Alam was convicted of aggravated attempted robbery, murder and arson and sentenced to 16 years' imprisonment and expulsion from Denmark. Ms Alam, who has spent nearly her entire life in Denmark and has permanent residence, complained that her expulsion would separate her from her children, born in Denmark in 2000 and 2004, and from the husband she recently married in 2015.
Application declared inadmissible for non-exhaustion of domestic remedies

Freedom of expression cases (Article 10)

Lings v. Denmark (no. 15136/20)
12.04.2022
The applicant is a doctor and the founder of a pro-assisted-suicide organisation, Physicians in Favour of Euthanasia. The case concerned his conviction on two counts of assisted suicide, and one count of attempted assisted suicide. He asserted that he had just been disseminating information about suicide.
No violation of Article 10

Frisk and Jensen v. Denmark
05.12.2017
The case concerned two Danish journalists working for a national television station and their conviction of defamation following a programme broadcast in 2008 criticising the treatment of cancer at Copenhagen University Hospital.
No violation of Article 10

Mortensen v. Denmark
21.10.2025
The case concerned the applicant's conviction for writing a post in 2021 on (the then-named) Twitter, calling into question the fact that a controversial leader of a political party, was "allowed to be a Nazi… [whereas another person was convicted for calling a police officer an idiot.]". Defamation proceedings were brought against Mr Mortensen. The courts found him guilty in 2023, ruling that the term "Nazi" had been unfounded. He was fined and ordered to pay compensation.
Violation of Article 10

Inadmissible application

Roj TV A/S v. Denmark

24.05.2018

The case concerned the applicant company's conviction for terrorism offences by Danish courts for promoting the Kurdistan Workers' Party (PKK) through television programmes broadcast between 2006 and 2010. The domestic courts found it established that the PKK could be considered a terrorist organisation within the meaning of the Danish Penal Code and that Roj TV A/S had supported the PKK's terror operation by broadcasting propaganda. It was fined and its licence was withdrawn.

Application declared iinadmissible as being incompatible *ratione materiae* with the provisions of the Convention.

Cases concerning the right to free elections (Article 3 of Protocol No. 1)

Strøbye and Rosenlind v. Denmark

02.02.2021

The case concerned the disenfranchisement of the applicants as a result of their having had their legal capacity removed.

No violation of Article 3 of Protocol No. 1

No violation of Article 14 (prohibition of discrimination)

Noteworthy pending cases

Chamber and Grand Chamber

Makki v. Denmark (no. 24292/24)

Case communicated to the Government in August 2024

Relinquishment in favour of the Grand Chamber on 28 April 2026

The case concerns a schizophrenic patient in a high security psychiatric facility being confined to his room for over three-and-a-half years.

The applicant relies on Articles 3 (prohibition of inhuman or degrading treatment), 5 (right to liberty and security) and 8 (right to respect for private and family life).

Ahmadi v. Denmark (no. 34608/23)

Case communicated to the Government in November 2023

and

Ahmad (formerly Ahmadi) v. Denmark (no. 5712/24)

Case communicated to the Government in March 2024

Relinquishment in favour of the Grand Chamber on 28 April 2026

These two cases were brought by the same applicant.

The first case concerns the placing, by a High Court judgment, of the applicant, who suffers from schizophrenia, in a high security psychiatric facility, where he was locked in his room for nearly two years. The applicant appealed against that measure to the Psychiatric Patients' Complaints Board, which found against him.

When the applicant brought compensation proceedings before the courts, the High Court found the confinement lawful, except for a specific 5-week period, for which it granted the applicant compensation, rejecting the remainder of his claim.

The second case concerns his placement in a psychiatric hospital, whilst awaiting admission to the high security psychiatric facility, and his being confined to his room for over eight months.

The applicant appealed against that measure to the Psychiatric Patients' Complaints Board, which dismissed his case.

Relying on Articles 3, 5 and 8 of the Convention, the applicant brought compensation proceedings before the courts. By a judgment of 10 November 2022, the High Court found the confinement lawful. Upon appeal, the Supreme Court found that, although the measure lacked authority under the Mental Health Act, it did not contravene those Convention provisions.

The applicant relies on Articles 3 (prohibition of inhuman or degrading treatment), 5 (right to liberty and security) and 8 (right to respect for private and family life).

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