Last updated: July 2026

Poland

Ratified the European Convention on Human Rights in 1993

National Judge: Anna Adamska-Gallant (16 December 2024 -)

Judges' CVs are available on the ECHR Internet site

Previous Judges: Jerzy Makarczyk (1992-2002) and Lech Garlicki (2002-2012), Krzysztof Wojtyczek (2012-2024)

List of judges of the Court since 1959

The Court dealt with 1,812 applications concerning Poland in 2025, of which 1,794 were declared inadmissible or struck out. It delivered 17 judgments (concerning 18 applications), 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	2130	3273	1669
Communicated to the Government	261	250	120
Applications decided:	1666	1812	1470
- Declared inadmissible or struck out (Single Judge)	1276	1599	1322
- Declared inadmissible or struck out (Committee)	253	187	141
- Declared inadmissible or struck out (Chamber)	50	8	1
- Decided by judgment	87	18	6

* 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:	3675
Single Judge	1331
Committee (3 Judges)	1783
Chamber (7 Judges)	560
Grand Chamber (17 Judges)	1

Poland 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

Grzęda v. Poland

15.03.2022

Reform of the judiciary in Poland as a result of which the office of a Supreme Administrative Court judge elected to the National Council of the Judiciary was terminated before the end of his four-year term.

Violation of Article 6 § 1 (right to a fair trial)

Kudla v. Poland

26.10.2000

Existence of an effective remedy to challenge the length of judicial proceedings.

No violation of Article 3 (prohibition of inhuman or degrading treatment)

Violation of Article 5 § 3 (right to liberty and security)

Violation of Article 6 § 1 (right to a trial within a reasonable time)

Violation of Article 13 (right to an effective remedy)

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

Violations of Article 1 of Protocol No. 1

Broniowski v. Poland

22.06.2004 (pilot judgment)[1]

Failure to take measures to compensate persons repatriated from the "territories beyond the Bug River" after the Second World War who had had to abandon property there. Structural problem. Some 80,000 people concerned.

See also **decisions of 12.12.2007** noting that a new law had been passed to settle cases of this type.

Hutten-Czapska v. Poland

19.06.2006 (pilot judgment)

Restrictive system of rent control which originated in laws passed under the former communist regime. The ceiling on rents was so low that they did not even cover building maintenance costs. Structural problem. Some 100,000 people concerned.

See also **Grand Chamber judgment of 28.04.2008** noting that a new law had been passed to settle cases of this type, and **closure of the pilot judgment procedure**.

Noteworthy cases, judgments delivered

Chamber

Right to life cases (Article 2)

Violation of Article 2

Olewnik-Cieplińska and Olewnik v. Poland

05.09.2019

The case concerned the kidnapping and murder of the applicants' brother and son, Krzysztof Olewnik. He was kidnapped in 2001, detained and ill-treated for over two years, then murdered despite the handover of the ransom demanded by the kidnappers. His body was recovered in 2006.

The Court found in particular that the domestic authorities had to be considered responsible for a series of serious errors on the part of the police in dealing with Mr Olewnik's kidnapping, which had ultimately resulted in his death.

Mojsiejew v. Poland

24.03.2009

Death in a sobering-up cell. Failure by the authorities to explain the circumstances of the death and to investigate.

[1] The pilot judgment procedure was developed as a technique of identifying the structural problems underlying repetitive cases against many countries and imposing an obligation on States to address those problems.
See the document "The Pilot judgment procedure" which is available on the ECHR's website.

Cases dealing with inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment (Article 3)

Violations of Article 3

Orchowski v. Poland and Sikorski v. Poland

22.10.2009

Structural problem of overcrowding in Polish prisons.

Kupczak v. Poland

25.01.2011

Paraplegic man suffering from severe chronic pain detained for over two and a half years without adequate medication.

R.R. v. Poland (no. 4047/07)

26.05.2011

Baby born severely disabled, his mother having been denied timely access to an amniocentesis.

Piechowicz v. Poland and Horych v. Poland

17.04.2012

Both cases concerned a regime in Polish prisons for detainees who are classified as dangerous.

Violation of Article 5 §§ 3 and 4 (right to liberty and security) in the case *Piechowicz v. Poland*

P. and S. v. Poland (no. 57375/08)

30.10.2012

The case concerned the difficulties encountered by a teenage girl, who had become pregnant as a result of rape, in obtaining access to an abortion, in particular due to the lack of a clear legal framework, procrastination of medical staff and also as a result of harassment.

Al Nashiri v. Poland and Husayn (Abu Zubaydah) v. Poland

24.07.2014

These cases concerned allegations of torture, ill-treatment and secret detention of two men suspected of terrorist acts. The applicants allege that they were held at a CIA "black site" in Poland.

In both cases:

Violation of Article 3 (prohibition of torture and inhuman or degrading treatment), in both its substantive and procedural aspects

Violation of Article 5 (right to liberty and security)

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

Violation of Article 13 (right to an effective remedy)

Violation of Article 6 § 1 (right to a fair trial)

The Court also decided that Poland had failed to comply with its obligation under Article 38 of Convention (obligation to furnish all necessary facilities for the effective conduct of an investigation).

As regards Mr Al Nashiri, the Court further held that there had been a violation of Articles 2 (right to life) and 3 of the Convention taken together with Article 1 of Protocol No. 6 (abolition of the death penalty).

Kanciał v. Poland

23.05.2019

The case concerned the applicant's allegations of police brutality during a raid by law-enforcement officers, in particular the use of an electrical discharge weapon.

M.K. and Others v. Poland (nos. 40503/17, 42902/17 and 43643/17)

23.07.2020

The case concerned the repeated refusal of Polish border guards on the border with Belarus to admit the applicants, who had come from Chechnya and had asked for international protection.

Liu v. Poland

06.10.2022

The case concerned the extradition proceedings brought against the applicant, on conclusion of which (in 2020) the Polish courts had authorised his handover to the authorities of the People's Republic of China. He was wanted for trial there in connection with a vast international telecomsfraud syndicate following a Sino-Spanish investigation. It also concerned his detention in Poland
pending extradition.

Violation of Article 5 § 1 (right to liberty and security)

No violations of Article 3

Rywin v. Poland

18.02.2016

The case concerned a corruption scandal involving Mr Rywin, a well-known film producer, which arose in the context of parliamentary proceedings for the amendment of the Broadcasting Act.

Cases dealing with Article 5 (right to liberty and security)

Stokłosa v. Poland

03.11.2011

The case concerned a complaint by a well-known ex-politician and businessman that a junior judge, appointed by the Minister of Justice, detained him in breach of the Convention.

Violation of Article 5 § 3

Grabowski v. Poland

30.06.2015

Mr Grabowski, 17 years old at the time, complained that his placement in a shelter for juveniles had been extended for a period of five months without a specific court order, pending a decision in correctional proceedings against him.

Violation of Article 5 §§ 1 and 4

Cases concerning Article 6

Right to a fair trial

Matyjek v. Poland

24.04.2007

The fairness of "lustration proceedings" aimed at exposing persons who worked for or collaborated with the State's security services during the communist period.

Violation of Article 6

Chim and Przywieczerski v. Poland

12.04.2018

The case concerned the applicants' trial and conviction for various offences related to the State-run Fund for the Service of Foreign Debt (FOZZ). The first applicant was a senior manager at the Fund while the second headed a company which had dealings with it.

Violation of Article 6

Słomka v. Poland

06.12.2018

The case concerned the applicant's 14-day custodial sentence for contempt of court after shouting slogans during the trial of communist-era generals who ordered martial law in the 1980s.

Violation of Article 6

Violation of Article 10 (right to freedom of expression)

Ćwik v. Poland

05.11.2020

The case concerned Mr Ćwik's complaint that proceedings against him for drug-trafficking had been unfair. He complained in particular that the courts had admitted in evidence statements by a third party which had been obtained through torture by members of a criminal gang.

Violation of Article 6

Lalik v. Poland

11.05.2023

The case concerned the applicant's defence rights and privilege against self-incrimination. In January 2016, while drunk, the applicant set fire to his drinking partner's jacket, with the latter sustaining severe burns and dying as a result. The applicant was convicted of aggravated murder and sentenced to 25 years' imprisonment. The judgments of the national courts referred explicitly to statements he had made during his informal questioning which had taken place before he had seen a lawyer and allegedly while still under the effect of alcohol.

Violation of Article 6 § 3 (c) (right to legal assistance of own choosing)

Wałęsa v. Poland

23.11.2023

The case concerned proceedings in which, following an extraordinary appeal by the Prosecutor General, the Chamber of Extraordinary Review and Public Affairs ("CERPA") of the Supreme Court reversed the final civil-court judgment which had been given in the applicant's favour in a defamation case some ten years earlier.

In view of the systemic nature of the alleged violations of Article 6 § 1 of the Convention, the Court applied the pilot-judgment procedure in this case. It found that the Chamber of Extraordinary Review and Public Affairs, which had examined the extraordinary appeal, was not an "independent and impartial tribunal established by law" and held that the extraordinary appeal had been incompatible with the rule of law, and notably with the principles of legal certainty, *res judicata* and foreseeability of the law.

Identifying that these violations originated in interrelated systemic problems connected with the malfunctioning of national legislation and practice, the Court called for urgent remedial measures.

Systemic violation of Article 6 § 1 as regards Mr Wałęsa's right to an independent and impartial tribunal established by law
Systemic violation of Article 6 § 1 for breaching the principle of legal certainty
Violation of Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life)

Application inadmissible

Kwiatkowski v. Poland

16.05.2019

The case concerned the adoption, by the *Sejm* (Polish Parliament), of a report concerning allegations of corruption in connection with the amendment of the Broadcasting Act. The report was alleged to have impugned the applicant's reputation and to have constituted a criminal conviction, without affording him an effective remedy.
Application declared inadmissible as manifestly ill-founded.

Issues related to the judiciary in Poland

Xero Flor w Polsce sp. z o.o. v. Poland

07.05.2021

The case concerned attempts by the applicant company to get compensation from the State for damage to one of its products (turf) by game. In particular, it had sued in 2012 but had been awarded only 60% of what it had sought. It had been unable to get satisfaction through the domestic courts. Although it had asked on several occasions that the question of the constitutionality of the relevant law be referred to the Constitutional Court, it had been turned down by the first-instance and appellate courts. Ultimately it had lodged a constitutional complaint that the Constitutional Court had declared inadmissible in 2017. The bench that had heard that case had contained Judge M.M., who had been elected by the new *Sejm* despite his seat having already been filled by the old *Sejm*.
Violation of Article 6 § 1 as regards the right to a fair hearing
Violation of Article 6 § 1 as regards the right to a tribunal established by law

Reczkowicz v. Poland

22.07.2021

The case concerned complaints brought by a barrister that the Disciplinary Chamber of the Polish Supreme Court, which had decided on a case concerning her, had not been a "tribunal established by law" and had lacked impartiality and independence.
Violation of Article 6

Advance Pharma sp. z o.o v. Poland

03.02.2022

The case concerned a complaint brought by the applicant company that the Civil Chamber of the Supreme Court, which had decided on a case concerning it, had not been a "tribunal established by law" and had lacked impartiality and independence.
Violation of Article 6 § 1

Żurek v. Poland

16.06.2022

Mr Żurek is a judge. He was also spokesperson for the National Council of the Judiciary (NCJ), the constitutional body in Poland which safeguards the independence of courts and judges. In that capacity, he has been one of the main critics of the changes to the judiciary initiated by the legislative and executive branches of the new Government which came to power in 2015.
The case concerned his removal from the NCJ before his term had ended, and his complaint that there had been no legal avenue to contest the loss of his seat. It also concerned his allegation of a campaign to silence him.
Violation of Article 6 § 1
Violation of Article 10 (freedom of expression)

Juszczyszyn v. Poland

06.10.2022

The case concerned the Disciplinary Chamber of the Supreme Court's disciplinary measures against a judge who had issued a court order for information on appointments of judges via the controversial "new" National Council of the Judiciary.
Unanimously, a violation of Article 6 § 1
By 5 votes to 2, a violation of Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life)
By 5 votes to 2, a violation of Article 18 (limitation on use of restrictions of rights) taken in conjunction with Article 8

Tuleya v. Poland

06.07.2023

The case originated in the new disciplinary regime for judges in Poland. The applicant, Igor Tuleya, a well-known judge,

complained about five sets of preliminary inquiries initiated against him in 2018 on suspicion of disciplinary misconduct.
Violation of Article 6 § 1
Violation of Article 8 (right to respect for private life)
Violation of Article 10 (freedom of expression)

Dudek and Lazur v. Poland and I.G. v. Poland and 19 other applications

07.11.2024
The cases concerned proceedings involving the applicants decided by formations of the Polish Supreme Court, which they alleged had not been "independent and impartial tribunal[s] established by law". The applications came in the context of the reorganisation of the judicial system in Poland in what had been described by many observers as a "rule-of-law crisis".
In *Dudek* and *Lazur* the Court accepted unilateral declarations by the Government, including an admission of a breach of Article 6 (right to a fair trial) of the Convention and an offer of compensation.
In the other cases, the Court accepted the friendly settlement agreed between the parties.
Applications struck off the Court's list of cases.

Right to a fair trial by an independent and impartial tribunal

Henryk Urban and Ryszard Urban v. Poland (no. 23614/08)

30.11.2010
Lack of independence of a trial court composed of a junior judge ("asesor sądowy").
Violation of Article 6 § 1

Rutkowski and Others v. Poland

07.07.2015 (Pilot judgment)[2]
Concerned the applicants' complaints that the length of the proceedings before the Polish courts in their cases had been excessive and that the operation of the remedy at national level for the excessive length of court proceedings was defective.
Violation of Article 6 § 1
Violation of Article 13 (right to an effective remedy)
The Court concluded that the situation of which the applicants complained had to be qualified as a practice which was incompatible with the European Convention and decided to apply the pilot-judgment procedure.
See also press release of 22 June 2017 concerning implementation of this pilot judgment.

Right of access to court

Woś v. Poland

08.06.2006
The Court found that Article 6 § 1 was applicable to proceedings brought by victims of forced labour under former Nazi Germany, before the Polish-German Reconciliation Foundation, under the so-called first compensation scheme.
Violation of Article 6 § 1

Apanasewicz v. Poland

03.05.2011
Failure to enforce a decision ordering the closure of a concrete production plant built unlawfully in a residential area.
Violation of Article 6 § 1
Violation of Article 8 (right to respect for the home)

Broda and Bojara v. Poland

29.06.2021
The case concerned the applicants' complaint that they did not have any remedy allowing them to challenge the decisions of the Minister of Justice to put a premature end to their term of office as vice-presidents of the Kielce Regional Court.
Violation of Article 6 § 1

Pająk and Others v. Poland

24.10.2023
The case concerned four judges who complained about legislative amendments that had lowered the retirement age for judges from 67 to 60 for women, and to 65 for men, and had made the continuation of a judge's duties after reaching retirement age conditional upon authorisation by the Minister of Justice and by the National Council of the Judiciary ("the NCJ").
Violation of Article 6 § 1 in respect of all applicants
Violation of Article 14 (prohibition of discrimination) taken in conjunction with

[2] The pilot judgment procedure was developed as a technique of identifying the structural problems underlying repetitive cases against many countries and imposing an obligation on States to address those problems.
See factsheet on Pilot judgments.

Article 8 (right to respect for private life) in respect of the three applicants who had lodged complaints under those provisions

Biliński v. Poland

15.01.2026

The case concerned the decision to transfer Mr Biliński, a judge, between two divisions of the same court, against his will, and his subsequent appeal against that decision.

Violation of Article 6 § 1

Morawiec v. Poland

05.02.2026

The case concerned rulings by the Disciplinary Chamber of the Supreme Court ("the DCSC") relating to Ms Morawiec's immunity from prosecution and to her suspension from judicial duties, which she argues were taken in reaction to her public criticisms of the judicial reforms and a successful civil action she had brought against the Minister of Justice in 2017.

Violation of Article 6 § 1, Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life) and Article 10 (freedom of expression)

Sobczyńska and Others v. Poland

21.05.2026

The case concerned a refusal in 2008 by the then President of the Republic to appoint the applicants to vacant judicial posts, without giving reasons, despite their having successfully participated in a competitive selection procedure and the absence of judicial review of that decision.

Violation of Article 6

Right to be assisted by a lawyer

Adamkiewicz v. Poland

02.03.2010

A minor was denied prompt access to a lawyer and his case was investigated and adjudicated by the same judge.

Violation of Article 6 § 3 (c) in conjunction with Article 6 § 1 (right to a fair trial)

Cases dealing with private and family life (Article 8)

Violations of Article 8

Giszczak v. Poland (no. 40195/08)

29.11.2011

The case concerned a Polish prisoner's complaint about not being allowed to visit his daughter who was in intensive-care and that, following her death, he decided not to go to her funeral as it was not clear whether he would have to attend in prison uniform and chains and under police escort.

Joanna Szulc v. Poland (no. 43932/08

13.11.2012

The case concerned the Polish authorities' refusal, for more than ten years, to grant a woman - who denied any collaboration with the security services during the communist era - access to all documents about her collected by those services. The Court held in particular that Poland had failed to put in place an effective procedure whereby interested parties could obtain access to security service documents concerning themselves.

K.J. v. Poland (no. 30813/14)

01.03.2016

The case concerned a Polish national's complaint about the proceedings before the Polish courts for the return of his child to the United Kingdom where he is currently living and where the child had been born and raised for the first two years of her life. The mother, also Polish, left the U.K. with their daughter for a holiday in Poland in July 2012 and has never returned. In the ensuing Hague Convention proceedings, the Polish courts dismissed the father's request for the return of his daughter.

Kacper Nowakowski v. Poland

10.01.2017

The case concerned the contact rights of a deaf and mute father with his son, who also has a hearing impairment. Mr Nowakowski, the applicant, complained in particular about the dismissal of his request to extend contact with his son.

Solska and Rybicka v. Poland

20.09.2018

The case concerned the exhumation of the victims killed in the Polish Air Force plane crash in Smolensk in 2010. The Polish prosecuting authorities ordered the exhumations in 2016 as part of the ongoing investigation into the crash, which killed 96 people, including the President of Poland. The authorities wanted to conduct autopsies to establish the cause of the crash, including the possibility of an explosion on board.

Przybyszewska and Others v. Poland
12.12.2023
The case concerned the alleged lack of any form of legal recognition and protection available for same-sex couples in Poland.

M.L. v. Poland (no. 40119/21)
14.12.2023
The applicant alleged in particular that she had been banned from having access to a legal abortion in the case of foetal abnormalities, following a 2020 Constitutional Court judgment. She had become pregnant and the foetus was diagnosed with trisomy 21. A scheduled hospital abortion had been cancelled when the legislative amendments resulting from the Constitutional Court ruling had come into force. Unable to have an abortion in Poland, she had ultimately had to travel to a private clinic abroad for the procedure.

Pietrzak and Bychawska-Siniarska and Others v. Poland
28.05.2024
The case concerned a complaint by five Polish nationals about Polish legislation authorising a secret-surveillance regime covering both operational control and the retention of telecommunications, postal and digital communications data ("communications data") for possible future use by the relevant national authorities. In particular, they alleged that there was no remedy available under domestic law allowing persons who believed that they had been subjected to secret surveillance to complain about that fact and to have its lawfulness reviewed.

A.R. v. Poland (no. 6030/21)
13.11.2025
The case concerned restrictions on abortion rights in Poland.

Morawiec v. Poland
05.02.2026
The case concerned rulings by the Disciplinary Chamber of the Supreme Court ("the DCSC") relating to Ms Morawiec's immunity from prosecution and to her suspension from judicial duties, which she argues were taken in reaction to her public criticisms of the judicial reforms and a successful civil action she had brought against the Minister of Justice in 2017.

A.P. and R.P. v. Poland (no. 1298/19)
02.07.2026
The case concerned the refusal by the Polish authorities to recognise a legal parent-child relationship established abroad.
Violation of the right to respect for private life and the prohibition on discrimination in respect of the child
No violation in respect of most of the complaints

No violation of Article 8

Wegrzynowski and Smolczewski v. Poland
16.07.2013
The case concerned the complaint by two lawyers that a newspaper article damaging to their reputation – which the Polish courts, in previous libel proceedings, had found to be based on insufficient information and in breach of their rights – remained accessible to the public on the newspaper's website.
The Court declared the complaint of Mr Węgrzynowski inadmissible as he had failed to lodge his complaint within the required time-limit (six months after the last decision of the Polish courts).

Y v. Poland (no. 74131/14)
17.02.2022
The case concerned applications by Y, a transgender man, to have reference to his gender assigned at birth removed from his birth certificate, or to have a new birth certificate issued.

Inadmissible application

Antkowiak v. Poland
14.06.2018
The case concerned a custody dispute over a child between the applicants, who are prospective adoptive parents, and the biological parents. The applicants wanted to adopt a baby from a woman who had agreed during her pregnancy to give up her child. However, she changed her mind when the baby was born. A legal dispute between the applicants and the biological parents is still ongoing. The child has been in the care of the applicant couple since being born in 2011.
Application declared inadmissible.

A.M. and Others v. Poland (nos. 4188/21, 4957/21, 5014/21,

5523/21, 5876/21, 6114/21, 6217/21, and 8857/21)

08.06.2023

The applications concerned restrictions on abortion rights in Poland. The applicants alleged in particular that, following amendments to the legislative framework in 2020, they have effectively been banned from having access to legal abortion in the case of foetal abnormalities.

Applications declared inadmissible.

A.D.-K. and Others v. Poland (no. 30806/15)

02.07.2026

The case concerned the refusal by the Polish authorities to recognise a legal parent-child relationship established abroad.

Application declared inadmissible.

Freedom of expression cases (Article 10)

Violations of Article 10

Wojtas-Kaleta v. Poland

16.07.2009

Public television journalist reprimanded for criticising the channel's programme policy.

Wizerkaniuk v. Poland

05.07.2011

Journalist convicted for publishing an interview with a politician without his consent.

Kaperzynski v. Poland

03.04.2012

The case concerned a journalist's criminal conviction for not having published a reply by a mayor to an article which criticised the authorities' dealing with deficiencies of the local sewage system.

Braun v. Poland

04.11.2014

The case concerned the complaint by a film director and historian about being ordered to pay a fine and to publish an apology for having damaged the reputation of a well-known professor to whom he had referred, in a radio debate, as an informant of the secret political police during the communist era.

Brzeziński v. Poland

25.07.2019

The case concerned an allegation that the applicant's freedom of expression had been breached, on account of comments made by him in an election campaign brochure.

Rabczewska v. Poland

15.09.2022

The case concerned a pop singer in Poland known as Doda and comments she had made in an interview about the Bible which the courts decided were blasphemous.

Drozd v. Poland

06.04.2023

The case concerned a one-year ban imposed on the applicants on entering the Sejm (the Polish Parliament's lower house). They were banned for displaying a banner – which read "Defend Independent Courts" (Brońcie niezależnych sadów) – in the grounds of the Sejm during a protest against the Government's planned reforms to the judiciary.

Sieć Obywatelska Watchdog Polska v. Poland

21.03.2024

The case concerned an NGO's attempts to gain access to diaries of meetings of two Constitutional Court judges and to that court's visitors' logbook.

Violation of Article 10 as concerned the refusal to grant the NGO access to the judges' meeting diaries

No violation of Article 10 as concerned access to the records of entry to the Constitutional Court building

Morawiec v. Poland

05.02.2026

The case concerned rulings by the Disciplinary Chamber of the Supreme Court ("the DCSC") relating to Ms Morawiec's immunity from prosecution and to her suspension from judicial duties, which she argues were taken in reaction to her public criticisms of the judicial reforms and a successful civil action she had brought against the Minister of Justice in 2017.

Cases dealing with discrimination issues (Article 14)

Baczkowski and Others v. Poland

03.05.2007 (see 'other noteworthy cases')

Kozak v. Poland

02.03.2010

Refusal to acknowledge a homosexual's right to take over a lease after his companion's death.

Violation of Article 14 in conjunction with Article 8 (right to respect for one's home)

Grzelak v. Poland (no. 7710/02)

15.06.2010

The applicants complained that their son was harassed and discriminated against for not following religious education classes.

Violation of Article 14 in conjunction with Article 9 (freedom of thought, conscience and religion)

X. v. Poland

16.09.2021

The case concerned proceedings the applicant brought to contest the removal of her youngest child from her custody after her former husband obtained a change in the custody arrangements ordered in the divorce judgment. She alleged that the courts had acted in his favour because of her relationship with another woman. Relying on Article 14 taken in conjunction with Article 8, the applicant complained that the domestic courts had refused to grant her custody of her child on the grounds of her sexual orientation.

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

Right to individual petition (Article 34)

M.K. and Others v. Poland (nos. 40503/17, 42902/17 and 43643/17)

23.07.2020

The case concerned the repeated refusal of Polish border guards on the border with Belarus to admit the applicants, who had come from Chechnya and had asked for international protection.

The Court held that Poland had failed to comply with its obligations under Article 34 (right to individual petition) of the Convention

Property issues (Article 1 of Protocol No. 1)

Violations of Article 1 of Protocol No. 1

Moskal v. Poland

15.09.2009

Reduction of a social security benefit following the correction of an administrative error.

Sierpiński v. Poland and Plechanow v. Poland

03.11.2009 and 07.07.2009

Applicants deprived of compensation for illegal expropriations because they applied to the wrong authority. They felt they were the victims of repeated administrative reforms, inconsistencies in the domestic law and lack of legal certainty.

Prohibition of collective expulsion (Article 4 of Protocol No. 4)

M.K. and Others v. Poland (nos. 40503/17, 42902/17 and 43643/17)

23.07.2020

The case concerned the repeated refusal of Polish border guards on the border with Belarus to admit the applicants, who had come from Chechnya and had asked for international protection.

Violation of Article 4 of Protocol No. 4

Violation of Article 13 (right to an effective remedy), in conjunction with Article 3 and Article 4 of Protocol No. 4

Other noteworthy cases, judgments delivered

Baczkowski and Others v. Poland

03.05.2007

Refusal of the mayor of Warsaw to authorise a gay rights march.

Violation of Articles 11 (freedom of assembly and association), 13 (right to an effective remedy) and 14 (prohibition of discrimination)

Frasik v. Poland and Jaremowicz v. Poland

05.01.2010

Arbitrary refusal by authorities to authorise detainees to marry. Lack of an effective remedy to challenge the refusal.

Violation of Articles 12 (right to marry), and 13 (right to an effective remedy) in both cases

Violation of Article 5 § 4 (right to liberty and security) in the case of Frasik v. Poland

Poklikayew v. Poland

22.06.2023

The case concerned Mr Poklikayew's expulsion from Poland in 2012 on national security grounds without his being fully informed of the reasons.

Violation of Article 1 of Protocol No. 7 (procedural safeguards relating to expulsion of aliens)

Noteworthy cases, decisions delivered

Łatak v. Poland and Łomiński v. Poland

12.10.2010

Could an appeal under Polish law be considered as an effective remedy against prison overcrowding (see the Orchowski and Sikorski cases mentioned above).

Applications declared inadmissible: detainees complaining of overcrowding in Polish prisons should bring a civil action before having their claim examined by the Court (see also this press release concerning further decisions in this respect).

Cichopek and 1,627 other applications

14.05.2013

These cases concern the reduction of the pension rights accumulated by former members of the Polish State Security between 1944 and 1990 during the time of the communist regime pursuant to the provisions of a law enacted in 2009.

The applicants' complaints were declared inadmissible either as manifestly ill-founded or incompatible with the provisions of the Convention.

Noteworthy pending cases

Grand Chamber

R.A. and Others v. Poland

Application notified to the Government in September 2021

The case concerns a group of 32 Afghan nationals who claim to have fled Afghanistan after the Taliban came to power. They were left stranded in a makeshift camp on the border between Belarus Poland from 8 August until 23 October 2021.

Further information can be found in the press releases of 25.08.2021, 28.09.2021 and 06.12.2021.

Case relinquished to the Grand Chamber in June 2024

Grand Chamber hearing on 12 February 2025

Chamber

Issues related to the judiciary in Poland

There are currently around 1,000 applications against Poland on the Court's docket submitted in the context of the reorganisation of the judicial system in Poland - in what has been described as a "rule-of-law crisis". The processing of a great majority of these applications has been further adjourned until 23 November 2026 to give more time to the Polish Government to adopt general measures following the Wałęsa v. Poland pilot-judgment.

See press releases published in November 2024 and November 2025.

Dziurda and Others v. Poland (no. 17392/26)

The case concerns four legal professionals who were elected on 13 March 2026 as judges of the Constitutional Court, but who have so far not been allowed to take up their duties.

See press release published in May 2026.

Kuczma v. Poland and 5 other applications (no. 36351/18)

Communicated to the Government in 2025

Concerning complaints about exposure to air pollution.

Krzysztof Brejza and others v. Poland (no. 27830/23)

Communicated to the Government in 2024

Concerning the alleged use of Pegasus spyware against the applicants who are well-known public figures in Poland and members of the opposition to the former Law and Justice government.

Stachowiak and Cieslinska Stachowiak v. Poland (nos. 51350/20 and 51637/20)
Kryszkiewicz v. Poland

Communicated to the Government in 2022

Alleged ill-treatment by the police.

I.Z. v. Poland (no. 57338/21)

Communicated to the Government in 2022

Concerning abortion rights.

Jarocki v. Poland (no. 39750/20)

Communicated to the Government in 2021

Concerning restrictions on demonstrations during COVID-19 pandemic.

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