Last updated: July 2026

The Netherlands

Ratified the European Convention on Human Rights in 1954

National Judge: Corinna Wissels (27 April 2026 -)
Judges' CVs are available on the ECHR Internet site

Previous Judges: Baron Frederik Mari Van Asbeck (1959-1966), Gerard J. Wiarda (1966-1985), André Donner (1986-1987), Sibrand Karel Martens (1988-1996), Petrus Van Dijk (1996-1998), Wilhelmina Thomassen (1998-2004), Egbert Myjer (2004-2012), Johannes Silvis (2012-2016), Jolien Schukking (2017-2026)

List of judges of the Court since 1959

The Court dealt with 262 applications concerning the Netherlands in 2025, of which 256 were declared inadmissible or struck out. It delivered three judgments (concerning six applications), one of which found at least one violations of the European Convention on Human Rights.

Applications processed in	2024	2025	2026*
Applications allocated to a judicial formation	240	285	157
Communicated to the Government	16	15	18
Applications decided:	199	262	148
- Declared inadmissible or struck out (Single Judge)	176	238	128
- Declared inadmissible or struck out (Committee)	17	17	7
- Declared inadmissible or struck out (Chamber)	1	1	3
- Decided by judgment	5	6	10

* from January to July

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:	217
Single Judge	88
Committee (3 Judges)	33
Chamber (7 Judges)	95
Grand Chamber (17 Judges)	1

The Netherlands 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

Interstate case

Ukraine and the Netherlands v. Russia (nos. 8019/16, 43800/14, 28525/20 and 11055/22)

09.07.2025

The case (application no. 28525/20) concerned the shooting down of flight MH17 over eastern Ukraine on 17 July 2014, killing all those on board, many of whom were Dutch nationals.

Violation of Articles 2 (right to life), 3 (prohibition of torture, inhuman or degrading treatment) and 13 (right to an effective remedy)

The case (applications nos. 8019/16, 43800/14 and 11055/22) also concerned the conflict that began in eastern Ukraine in 2014 following the arrival in the Donetsk and Luhansk regions of pro-Russian armed groups, and escalated after Russia's full-scale invasion of Ukraine beginning on 24 February 2022.

As concerned these three applications, the Court found that there had been patterns of violations of multiple articles of the European Convention.

See here for the press release and FAQ in Dutch.

***

The application concerning the downing of flight MH17 was disjoined from the other three applications to allow for the examination of the just satisfaction claims separately. It is now called ***The Netherlands v. Russia*** and is currently pending (see below).

Cases concerning the right to life (Article 2)

Violation of Article 2

Jaloud v. the Netherlands

20.11.2014

The case concerned the investigation by the Netherlands authorities into the circumstances surrounding the death of an Iraqi civilian who died of gunshot wounds in Iraq in April 2004 in an incident involving Netherlands Royal Army personnel.

Ramsahai and Others v. the Netherlands

15.05.2007

The case concerned the applicants' relative who, after stealing a motor scooter by threatening its owner with a pistol, was shot dead by a police officer who was trying to arrest him.

Cases concerning inhuman or degrading treatment (Article 3)

Violation of Article 3

Murray v. the Netherlands

26.04.2016

The case concerned the complaint by a man convicted of murder in 1980, who consecutively served his life sentence on the islands of Curaçao and Aruba (part of the Kingdom of the Netherlands) – until being granted a pardon in 2014 due to his deteriorating health –, about his life sentence without any realistic prospect of release.

Before the Court, Mr Murray initially complained, in particular, that his life sentence was irreducible and that there was no separate regime for life prisoners or a special regime for detainees with psychiatric problems in the prisons where he was being held. Following the conclusion of the periodic review of his sentence in 2012 he complained that even if a possibility of conditional release had been created under the law, *de facto* he had no hope of release as he had never been provided with any psychiatric treatment and therefore the risk of recidivism was considered too high for him to be eligible for such release.

Cases regarding private and family life (Article 8)

Violation of Article 8

Van Slooten v. the Netherlands
(no. 45644/18)
15.04.2025
The case concerned the termination of Ms van Slooten's parental authority over her daughter, who had been placed in foster care.

Jeunesse v. the Netherlands
03.10.2014
The case concerned the refusal by the authorities to allow a Surinamese woman married to a Netherlands national, with whom she had three children, to reside in the Netherlands on the basis of her family life in the country.

No violations of Article 8

Ships Waste Oil Collector B.V. and Others v. the Netherlands
(nos. 2799/16, 2800/16, 3124/16 and 3205/16)
01.04.2025
The case concerned the transmission of "by-catch" data, lawfully obtained in criminal investigations through telephone tapping, to another law enforcement authority, the Competition Authority, that had used those data in unrelated administrative investigations into the applicant companies' involvement in price-fixing.
No violation of Article 8
No violation of Article 13

Van der Heijden v. the Netherlands
03.04.2012
The case concerned the national courts' refusal to exempt Ms van der Heijden from testifying against her long-term partner, who was suspected of killing someone.

Üner v. the Netherlands
18.10.2006
Following criminal conviction, exclusion order imposed on Turkish national whose partner and child reside in the Netherlands.

Freedom of expression cases (Article 10)

Sanoma Uitgevers B.V. v. the Netherlands
14.09.2010
Police seizure of material that could have led to identification of journalistic sources.
Violation of Article 10

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

Garib v. the Netherlands
06.11.2017
The case concerned the complaint by a woman living on social welfare about residential restrictions in Tarwewijk, a district of Rotterdam with high unemployment, as a result of which she was unable to freely choose her place of residence. The legislation in question made taking up new residence in designated areas conditional on a housing permit, for which Ms Garib did not qualify since her income was not from work and she had not been a resident in the Rotterdam Metropolitan Region for six years immediately preceding her request.
No violation of Article 2 of Protocol No. 4

Chamber

Cases concerning inhuman and/or degrading treatment (Article 3)

Violations of Article 3

Y.F.C. and Others v. the Netherlands (nº 21325/19)
21.04.2026
L'affaire concernait sept ressortissants vénézuéliens interceptés en avril 2019 au large des côtes de Curaçao (un pays au sein du Royaume des Pays-Bas situé dans le sud des Caraïbes), puis arrêtés, débarqués et placés en détention dans l'attente de leur éloignement.

A.M.A. v. the Netherlands
(no. 23048/19)
24.10.2023
The case concerned the applicant's removal to Bahrain in 2018 following a risk assessment made in the context of his last-minute asylum application.

A. v. the Netherlands (no. 4900/06)
20.07.2010
Expulsion of acquitted terrorist suspect to Libya.

Salah Sheekh v. the Netherlands
11.01.2007
Alleged risk of being subjected to torture or inhuman or degrading treatment, in case of expulsion, in view of the applicant's situation of belonging to a minority (Ashraf), in the light of the general human rights situation in Somalia.

No violation of Article 3

F.B. and Others v. the Netherlands (nos. 28157/18 and 6 Others)
21.04.2026
The case concerned the applicants' complaints that Dutch legislation and procedures made their life sentences irreducible.

Mawaka v. the Netherlands
01.06.2010
Alleged risk of ill-treatment in case of expulsion in view of the applicant's past activities in the Democratic Republic of the Congo.

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

Violations of Article 5

Y.F.C. and Others v. the Netherlands (nº 21325/19)
21.04.2026
See also the cases dealing with Article 3

S.T.S. v. the Netherlands (no. 277/05)
07.06.2011
Failure to rule on the legality of the detention of the applicant, a minor, on the ground that the order authorising his detention had already expired – a decision which denied him access to compensation.

Nelissen v. the Netherlands
05.04.2011
Schizophrenic patient's continued detention in remand prison upon completion of sentence unjustified.

Case concerning Article 6

Right to a fair trial

de Legé v. the Netherlands
04.10.2022
The case concerned tax fines imposed on the applicant, a Dutch national, following his failure to comply with his legal obligation to provide all relevant information for the purpose of tax levying, including documents relating to a bank account he held in Luxembourg.
No violation of Article 6 § 1

Stichting Landgoed Steenbergen and Others v. the Netherlands
16.02.2021
The case concerned the online notification of a draft decision and decision regarding an application to expand services at a motocross track, which the applicants claimed had impinged on their access to a court, as they had been unaware of the decision.
No violation of Article 6 § 1

Baydar v. the Netherlands
24.04.2018
The case concerned a complaint by Mr Baydar about the Supreme Court's refusal, based on summary reasoning, to refer his request for a preliminary ruling to the Court of Justice of the European Union (CJEU).
No violation of Article 6

M v. the Netherlands (no. 2156/10)
25.07.2017
The case concerned a former member of the Netherlands secret service who had been charged with leaking State secrets. The applicant, Mr M, complained before the European Court of Human Rights that the ensuing criminal proceedings had been unfair.
No violation of Article 6 §§ 1 and 3 (b) (right to legal assistance of own choosing) as regards redacting of certain documents and the alleged withholding of others
Violation of Article 6 §§ 1 and 3 (c) as regards the restrictions on the applicant's right to give information and instructions to counsel
No violation of Article 6 §§ 1 and 3 (d) as regards the conditions under which certain

AIVD[1] members were heard as witnesses and the refusal to call certain other AIVD members as defence witnesses
The Court also decided that that it was not necessary to consider whether there has been a violation of Article 6 §§ 1 and 3 (c) as regards the limitation on revealing the names of AIVD members before the Court of Appeal.

Cases concerning private and family life (Article 8)

Violations of Article 8

Azzaqui v. the Netherlands
30.05.2023
The case concerned the revocation of Mr Azzaqui's residence permit in 2018 and a ten-year entry ban to the Netherlands on the grounds that he was a threat to public order.

Telegraaf Media Nederland Landelijke Media B.V. and Others v. the Netherlands
22.11.2012
The case concerned the protection of journalistic sources.

Van Vondel v. the Netherlands
25.10.2007
The applicant was a police officer for the Criminal Intelligence Service. His telephone conversations with one of his informers had been recorded with devices provided by the National Police Internal Investigation Department, in the context of a parliamentary inquiry brought into criminal investigation methods in the Netherlands due to a controversy surrounding the North-Holland/Utrecht Interregional Criminal Investigation Team.

Inadmissible decision

De Kok v. the Netherlands
19.05.2022
The applicant complained about the obligation to buy basic health insurance in the Netherlands and the consequences of his not having done so.
Application declared inadmissible.

Yeshtla v. the Netherlands
07.02.2019
The case concerned a complaint brought by a naturalised Dutch national of Ethiopian origin about the termination of her means-tested housing benefit. The authorities found that she was not entitled to such benefits for the years 2006 and 2007 because her son, who had been living with her since their reunion in 2002, did not have a residence permit. The Dutch courts' rejected all her appeals. She argued that the decision had breached her rights under Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life) and Article 14 (prohibition of discrimination).
Application declared inadmissible as manifestly ill-founded.

Freedom of expression cases (Article 10)

Violations of Article 10

Telegraaf Media Nederland Landelijke Media B.V. and Others v. the Netherlands
22.11.2012
See also the cases dealing with Article 8

Voskuil v. the Netherlands
22.11.2007
Journalist's complaint that he was denied the right not to disclose his source for two articles he had written for the newspaper Sp!ts and that he was detained for more than two weeks in an attempt to compel him to do so.

No violation of Article 10

Nederlandse Omroep Stichting and Others v. the Netherlands (no. 20066/18)
22.11.2007
The case concerned requests by two broadcasting organisations and a newspaper for the disclosure of information relating to the Dutch Government's handling of the downing of Malaysia Airlines flight MH17 in July 2014.

[1] Algemene Inlichtingen- en Veiligheidsdienst (AIVD) - General Intelligence and Security Service

Cases concerning freedom of assembly and association (Article 11)

Laurijsen and Others v. the Netherlands
21.11.2023
The case concerned a protest against the eviction of a squat at Passeerdersgracht in Amsterdam.

Cases concerning the right to an effective remedy (Article 13)

A.M. v. the Netherlands (no. 29094/09)
05.07.2016
The case concerned the complaint by an asylum seeker that his expulsion to Afghanistan would expose him to a real risk of torture or of inhuman or degrading treatment.
No violation of Article 13 taken together with Article 3 (prohibition of torture and of inhuman or degrading treatment)
No violation of Article 3 in the event of A.M.'s removal to Afghanistan

Noteworthy cases, decisions delivered

Italmoda Mariano Previti et autres c. Pays-Bas (n° 16395/18)
16.10.2025
The case concerned the issuing of supplementary tax assessments on the ground that the conditions for eligibility for value added tax (VAT) benefits were not met.
Application declared inadmissible

P. Plaisier B.V. v. the Netherlands and two other applications
07.12.2017
The applications concerned complaints by three companies about an additional tax which employers had to pay on salaries above 150,000 euros that was part of budget austerity measures approved during an economic crisis.
Applications declared inadmissible as manifestly ill-founded.

Mustafić-Mujić and Others v. the Netherlands
22.09.2016
The applicants, relatives of men killed in the Srebrenica massacre of July 1995, imputed criminal responsibility to three Netherlands servicemen who were members of the UN peacekeeping force.
They complained that the Netherlands authorities had wrongly refused to investigate and prosecute the servicemen for allegedly sending their relatives to their probable death by ordering them to leave the safety of the UN peacekeepers' compound after the Bosnian Serb forces had overrun Srebrenica and its environs.
Application declared inadmissible.

Adorisio and Others v. the Netherlands
17.03.2015
The case concerned the accelerated proceedings allowing bond holders to challenge the lawfulness of the Netherlands Government's expropriation of the assets they held in SNS Reaal, a banking and insurance conglomerate.
Application declared inadmissible.

Constancia v. the Netherlands
03.03.2015
The case concerned Mr Constancia's complaint about being detained as a person of "unsound mind" in the absence of a precise diagnosis of his mental state. Mr Constancia, who was convicted of the violent manslaughter of an eight-year old boy, had refused to be examined, making the assessment of his mental condition impossible.
Application declared inadmissible as manifestly ill-founded.

A.M.E. v. the Netherlands (no. 51428/10)
13.01.2015
The case concerned a Somali asylum-seeker's claim that, if transferred to Italy, he would be subjected to harrowing living conditions.
Application declared inadmissible as manifestly ill-founded.

Stichting Mothers of Srebrenica and Others v. the Netherlands
11.06.2013
The case concerned the complaint by relatives of victims of the 1995 Srebrenica massacre, and by an NGO representing

victims' relatives, of the Netherlands courts' decision to declare their case against the United Nations (UN) inadmissible on the ground that the UN enjoyed immunity from national courts' jurisdiction. The applicants alleged in particular that their right of access to court had been violated by that decision.
Application declared inadmissible as manifestly ill-founded.

Mohammed Hussein v. the Netherlands and Italy

02.04.2013
The case concerned a Somali asylum seeker who claimed in particular that she and her two young children would be subjected to ill-treatment if transferred from the Netherlands to Italy under the Dublin Regulation.
Application declared inadmissible: The Court found in particular that, if returned to Italy, the future prospects of Ms Mohammed Hussein and her two children did not disclose a sufficiently real and imminent risk of hardship severe enough to fall within the scope of Article 3.

Ramaer and van Willigen v. the Netherlands

23.10.2012
The case concerned the effects of the changes in the Netherlands health insurance system introduced on 1 January 2006 on recipients of Netherlands pensions resident in European Union Member States other than the Netherlands. There are, according to the applicants, 40,000 persons concerned, particularly in Spain, Portugal, France and Belgium.
Application declared inadmissible

Schilder v. the Netherlands

16.10.2012
The parish priest of a Catholic church complained that pursuant to a new by-law the church bell could not be rung between 11 p.m. and 7.30 a.m. above a certain volume.
Application declared inadmissible

Djokaba Lambi Longa v. the Netherlands

09.10.2012
The case concerned a Congolese national transferred to the International Criminal Court (ICC) to give evidence as a defence witness, who applied for asylum in the Netherlands after giving testimony.
Application declared inadmissible : ruling for the first time on the issue of the power to keep individuals in custody of international criminal tribunals having their seat within the territory of a Contracting State, the Court concluded that the applicant, detained on the territory of a Contracting State (the Netherlands) by an international criminal tribunal (the ICC) under arrangements entered into with a State not party to the Convention (the Democratic Republic of the Congo) did not fall within the jurisdiction of the Netherlands.

F.A.K. v. the Netherlands (no. 30112/09)

23.10.2012
Intended deportation of an imam understood by the Netherlands authorities to preach violent jihad (holy war). He has consistently claimed to be wanted by the authorities of his country of origin for political reasons. Complaints under Articles 3 (prohibition of inhuman or degrading treatment), 8 (right to respect for private life) and 13 (right to an effective remedy).
Application declared inadmissible

Staatkundig Gereformeerde Partij v. the Netherlands

10.07.2012
The Supreme Court ruled against the applicant, a political party, for not allowing women members to run for elections.
The applicant complained of an infringement of its right of freedom of religion (Article 9), freedom of expression (Article 10) and freedom of assembly and association (Article 11).
Application declared inadmissible

Ramzy v. the Netherlands

20.07.2010
Alleged risk of treatment contrary to Article 3 (prohibition of inhuman or degrading treatment) in case of expulsion of an acquitted terrorist suspect to Algeria.
Case struck out of the list: applicant no longer in contact with his representatives.

Van Anraat v. the Netherlands

06.07.2010
Criminal conviction of the applicant of having supplied a chemical to Iraq between 1984 and 1988 which was used to produce

mustard gas that was subsequently used against civilians in Iraq and Iran. The applicant complained that the Supreme Court had failed to answer his argument that, since Saddam Hussein and Ali Hassan al-Majid al-Tikriti were beyond the jurisdiction of the Netherlands courts, he ought not to have been convicted as their accessory. He also complained that section 8 of the War Crimes Act, in referring to international law, did not comply with the requirement that criminal acts be described with sufficient precision.
Application declared inadmissible: When the applicant was committing the acts which ultimately led to his prosecution, there was nothing unclear about the criminal nature of the use of mustard gas either against an enemy in an international conflict or against a civilian population in border areas affected by an international conflict. Therefore, the applicant could reasonably have been expected to be aware of the state of the law and, if need be, to take appropriate advice

Kemevuako v. the Netherlands

25.06.2010

Concerned an application submitted out of time by an asylum seeker.
Application declared inadmissible: The Court emphasised the need for it to receive the originals of the application and authority forms, if the applicant was represented in the Strasbourg proceedings. Transmission by fax of those documents, without the originals, was insufficient to constitute a complete or valid application.

Galic v. the Netherlands and **Blagojevic v. the Netherlands**

09.06.2009

Allegations that proceedings conducted before, and decisions taken by, the International Criminal Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia violated Article 6 (right to a fair trial).
Application declared inadmissible: The Court is not competent to examine these allegations.

Cooperatieve Producentenorganisatie van de Nederlandse Kokkelvisserij U.A. v. the Netherlands

20.01.2009

Applicant association's complaint about the unfairness of proceedings before the Court of Justice of the European Communities (ECJ) with regard to its right to dredge cockles in a tidal wetland area, the Wadden Sea.
Application declared inadmissible: The applicant association had not shown that the fair trial guarantees available to it had been manifestly deficient. It had therefore failed to rebut the presumption that the procedure before the ECJ provided equivalent protection of its fundamental rights.

Noteworthy pending cases

Kuijt v. the Netherlands

Case relinquished to the Grand Chamber on 26.08.2025

Concerns the practice in the Supreme Court of the Netherlands by which judges of the Criminal Law Division who do not form part of the formation to which a case has been assigned may participate in the deliberations. This is allowed in the interest of legal unity (*rechtseenheid*).
A Grand Chamber hearing took place on 21 January 2026

Inter-State case

Netherlands v. Russia (no. 28525/20)

Concerns the question of just satisfaction in the application regarding the downing of flight MH17.
A judgment dealing with the merits of the application was handed down on 09.07.2025 (see above).
***
There are also four individual applications lodged by over 500 relatives of MH17 victims, awaiting examination of the admissibility and merits.

For more information, see the Q and A on inter-State cases.

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