Last updated: July 2026

Sweden

Ratified the European Convention on Human Rights in 1952

National Judge: Erik Wennerström (1 April 2019 -)
Judges' CVs are available on the ECHR Internet site

Previous Judges: Åke Ernst Holmbäck (1959-1971), Sture Petrén (1971-1976), Gunnar Lagergren (1977-1988), Elisabeth Palm (1988-2003), Elisabet Fura (2003-2012), (2012–2018) Helena Jäderblom (2012-2018)

List of judges of the Court since 1959

The Court dealt with 191 applications concerning Sweden in 2025, of which 190 were declared inadmissible or struck out. It delivered 1 judgment (concerning 1 application), which did not find any violation of the European Convention on Human Rights.

Applications processed in	2024	2025	2026*
Applications allocated to a judicial formation	266	206	135
Communicated to the Government	15	13	6
Applications decided:	225	191	126
- Declared inadmissible or struck out (Single Judge)	219	183	123
- Declared inadmissible or struck out (Committee)	2	4	1
- Declared inadmissible or struck out (Chamber)	0	3	0
- Decided by judgment	4	1	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:	101
Single Judge	73
Committee (3 Judges)	13
Chamber (7 Judges)	15
Grand Chamber (17 Judges)	0

Sweden 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

J.K. and Others v. Sweden
(no. 59166/12)

23 August 2016

The case concerned three Iraqi nationals who had sought asylum in Sweden and whose deportation to Iraq had been ordered.

Violation of Article 3 (prohibition of torture and inhuman or degrading treatment) if the order for the applicants' deportation to Iraq were implemented

F.G. v. Sweden (no. 43611/11)

23 March 2016

The case concerned the refusal of asylum to an Iranian national converted to Christianity in Sweden. The applicant, F.G., notably alleged that, if expelled to Iran, he would be at a real risk of being persecuted and punished or sentenced to death owing to his political past in the country and his conversion from Islam to Christianity.

No violation of Article 2 (right to life) and Article 3 (prohibition of torture and of inhuman or degrading treatment) on account of F.G.'s political past in Iran, if he were deported to his country of origin

Violation of Articles 2 and 3 if F.G. were to be returned to Iran without a fresh and up-to-date assessment being made by the Swedish authorities of the consequences of his religious conversion

M.E. v. Sweden and W.H. v. Sweden
(nos. 71398/12 et 49341/10)

08 April 2015

The first case concerned an asylum seeker's threatened expulsion from Sweden to Libya, where he alleged he would be at risk of persecution and ill-treatment because he is a homosexual.

The second case concerned an asylum seeker's threatened expulsion from Sweden to Iraq, where she alleged she would be at risk of ill-treatment as a single woman of Mandaean denomination, a vulnerable ethnic/religious minority.

As both applicants had been granted residence permits by the Migration Board in Sweden, the Court, unanimously, held that it was appropriate to strike these two applications out of its list of cases.

Söderman v. Sweden

12 November 2013

The case concerned the attempted covert filming of a 14-year old girl by her stepfather while she was naked, and her complaint that the Swedish legal system, which at the time did not prohibit filming without someone's consent, had not protected her against the violation of her personal integrity.

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

Gillberg v. Sweden

3 April 2012

The case concerned a professor's criminal conviction for misuse of office in his capacity as a public official, for refusing to comply with two administrative court judgments granting access, under specified conditions, to the University of Gothenburg's research on hyperactivity and attention deficit disorders in children to two named researchers.

The Court found in particular that the professor could not rely on Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life) to complain about his criminal conviction and that he could not rely on a "negative" right to freedom of expression, the right not to give information, under Article 10 (freedom of expression) of the European Convention on Human Rights.

Chamber

Cases dealing with the right to life (Article 2)

A.A. v. Sweden (no. 4677/20)

13.07.2023

The case concerned the refusal of the applicant's 2015 asylum claim and the order to deport him to Libya.

The applicant's removal would not be in violation of either Article 2 and/or Article 3 (prohibition of inhuman or degrading treatment)

K.A.B. v. Sweden (no. 886/11)

5 September 2013

The case addresses the prevailing security situation in Mogadishu (Somalia). It concerned a Somali national, originally from Mogadishu, who alleged that his deportation from Sweden to Somalia would put him at real risk of being killed or subjected to ill-treatment.

No violation of Article 2 or Article 3 (prohibition of inhuman or degrading treatment) if the applicant were returned to Somalia.

A.G.A.M., D.N.M., M.K.N., M.Y.H. and Others, N.A.N.S., N.M.B., N.M.Y. and Others and S.A. v. Sweden (nos. 71680/10, 28379/11, 72413/10, 50859/10, 68411/10, 68335/10, 72686/10 and 66523/10)

27 June 2013

All eight cases concerned the deportation of failed asylum-seekers, originally from Baghdad, Mosul and Kirkuk, to Iraq. The two applicants in the cases D.N.M. and S.A. alleged in particular that, if deported to Iraq, they would be at risk of being the victims of an honour-related crime following their relationships with women which had met with their families' disapproval. The applicants in the other six cases alleged that, if deported to Iraq, they would be at risk of persecution on account of their being Christians, a religious minority in the country.

No violation of Articles 2 and 3 (prohibition of inhuman and degrading treatment) if the applicants were deported to Iraq

F.H. v. Sweden (no. 32621/06)

20 January 2009

The applicant, an Iraqi national of Christian faith, had been an army major in the Republican Guard under Saddam Hussein. Allegedly, he had been ordered to participate in the killing of Shi'ites and had left for Sweden (in 1992). He had applied for asylum but while his application was pending, in 1995, he was sentenced to forensic psychiatric care for having murdered his wife. His expulsion from Sweden was also ordered. Following the fall of Saddam Hussein and the U.S. led invasion of Iraq, the applicant claimed that he would be sentenced to death by the Iraqi high tribunal or killed by Shi'ite militias due to his membership in the Republican Guard.

No violation of Articles 2 or 3 (prohibition of inhuman or degrading treatment)

Cases dealing with inhuman and/or degrading treatment (Article 3)

D.M. v. Sweden (no. 32694/23)

26.03.2026

The case concerned an order to remove an Afghan national from Sweden. His removal was ordered because he was not entitled to a residence permit in Sweden after several unsuccessful applications for asylum since 2015.

Violation of Article 3 if the deportation order against the applicant, Mr D.M., was implemented

Bijan Balahan v. Sweden

29.06.2023

The case concerned the authorities' decision to extradite Mr Bijan Balahan from Sweden to the US.

No violation of Article 3 if the applicant was extradited from Sweden

I v. Sweden (no. 61204/09)

5 September 2013

The case concerned the Swedish authorities' decision to reject a request for asylum lodged by a family from Chechnya (Russia) who stated that they would be exposed to a real risk of ill-treatment if returned to Russia.

Violation of Article 3 if the applicants were deported to Russia

F.N. and Others v. Sweden (no. 52077/10)

18 December 2012

The applicants are a family from Uzbekistan whose asylum and residence permits were rejected by the Swedish Migration Board. They complained that if deported to Uzbekistan they would be persecuted, arrested, ill-treated and maybe even killed.

Violation of Article 3 in the event of the applicants' deportation to Uzbekistan

S.F. and others v. Sweden (no. 52077/10)

15 May 2012

The case concerned a complaint by an Iranian family - who fled Iran in fear of persecution because of their involvement

with a Kurdish-rights political party – that they would be tortured or otherwise ill-treated if deported to Iran.
Violation of Article 3 if the applicants were expelled from Sweden

Ahorugeze v. Sweden

27 October 2011
No violation of the Convention if the applicant were extradited to Rwanda. The case concerned the complaints by a genocide suspect, that, if extradited from Sweden to Rwanda, he risked ill-treatment and a flagrant denial of justice.
No violation of Article 3
No violation of Article 6 (right to a fair trial)

F.H. v. Sweden (no. 32621/06)

20 January 2009
(See cases concerning Article 2)

Cases on Article 5 (right to liberty and security)

Göthlin v. Sweden

16 October 2014
The case concerned Mr Göthlin's complaints about his detention for over a month for refusing to reveal where he had hidden a mobile sawmill in enforcement proceedings against him.
No violation of Article 5 § 1

Inadmissibility decision

Bencheref v. Sweden

11 January 2018
The applicant, Kader Bencheref, had complained about the length of time that Sweden had held him in detention pending expulsion, lasting from September 2008 by the time of his application to the Court in 2015. However, the Court noted that Mr Bencheref had all along told the Swedish authorities that he was Moroccan, only revealing in 2016 that he was Algerian. The expulsion order had then been carried out within a few months.
The Court concluded that the application had to be rejected as an abuse of the right of application under Article 35 §§ 3 (a) and 4 of the European Convention.

Cases dealing with Article 6

Access to court

Arlewin v. Sweden

1 March 2016
The case concerned the Swedish courts' decision to decline jurisdiction in defamation proceedings arising out of the content of a transborder television programme service.
Violation of Article 6 § 1

Handölsdalen Sami Village and Others v. Sweden

30 March 2010
The case concerned proceedings brought by Härjedalen landowners in 1990 against five villages, including the applicants, seeking to obtain a judgment forbidding them from using private land for reindeer grazing. The domestic courts found against the applicants after 13-and-a-half years' proceedings.
No violation of Article 6 §1 with regard to effective access to court
Violation of Article 6 § 1 with regard to the length of the proceedings

Cases on private and family life (Article 8)

M.T. and Others v. Sweden

20.10.2022
The case concerned the suspension of family reunification in Sweden between July 2016 and July 2019 for those, such as the second applicant, who had been given temporary-protection status.
No violation of Article 8
No violation of Article 14 (prohibition of discrimination) taken in conjunction with Article 8

Thörn v. Sweden

01.09.2022
The case concerned the conviction and fine issued to Mr Thörn for a cannabis offence. He asserted that he had been taking the drug for pain relief, but did not have a prescription to that effect. He had been confined to a wheelchair since 1994 following breaking his neck in a traffic accident, with many pain-related issues in the years since. At the time, medical cannabis was available in Sweden, ordinarily for the treatment of multiple sclerosis.
No violation of Article 8

Centrum för rättvisa v. Sweden

25.05.2021

The case concerned the alleged risk that the applicant foundation's communications had been or would be intercepted and examined by way of signals intelligence, as it communicated on a daily basis with individuals, organisations and companies in Sweden and abroad by email, telephone and fax, often on sensitive matters.

Violation of Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life, the home and correspondence)

Inadmissibility decisions

Abokar v. Sweden

06 June 2019

The case concerned the Swedish authorities' refusal to grant the applicant a residence permit for family reunion purposes.

Application declared inadmissible as manifestly ill-founded.

Pihl v. Sweden

09 March 2017

Mr Pihl had been the subject of a defamatory online comment, which had been published anonymously on a blog. The applicant made a civil claim against the small non-profit association which ran the blog, claiming that it should be held liable for the third-party comment. The claim was rejected by the Swedish courts and the Chancellor of Justice. The applicant complained to the Court that by failing to hold the association liable, the authorities had failed to protect his reputation and had violated his right to respect for his private life.

Application declared inadmissible as manifestly ill-founded.

Freedom of expression cases (Article 10)

Vejdeland and others v. Sweden

9 February 2012

The case concerned the applicants' conviction in 2005 for distributing leaflets in a secondary school, which were considered by the courts to be offensive to homosexuals.

No violation of Article 10

Khurshid Mustafa and Tarzibachi v. Sweden (no. 23883/06)

16 December 2008

The applicants, a family with three children of Iraqi origin, were evicted from their flat for refusing to dismount a satellite installation.

Violation of Article 10

Property rights cases (Article 1 of Protocol No. 1)

Evaldsson and Others v. Sweden

13 February 2007

The applicants, five non-unionised construction workers, maintained that they were forced to contribute to the financing of a union's general activities by having to pay 1.5% of their salary as a monitoring fee to the local union branch, in accordance with a collective labour agreement.

Violation of Article 1 of Protocol No. 1

Other noteworthy cases, judgments delivered

Lucky Dev v. Sweden

27 November 2014

The present case concerned the legislation in Sweden for tax-related offences. Ms Lucky Dev, the applicant, claimed that she had been tried and punished twice for the same offence in tax and criminal proceedings instituted against her.

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

In 2014, the Court also declared inadmissible three applications concerning a similar issue for failure to exhaust domestic remedies (*Shibendra Dev v. Sweden*, *Henriksson v. Sweden* and *Åberg v. Sweden*).

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