Last updated: July 2026

Slovenia

Ratified the European Convention on Human Rights in 1994

National Judge: Vasilka Sancin

Term of office: (30 May 2025 -)
Judges' CVs are available on the ECHR Internet site

Previous Judge: Peter Jambrek (1993-1998), Boštjan Zupančič (1998-2016), Marko Bošnjak (2016-2025)

List of judges of the Court since 1959

The Court dealt with 217 applications concerning Slovenia in 2025, of which 216 were declared inadmissible or struck out. It delivered 1 judgment (concerning 1 application), 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	382	203	120
Communicated to the Government	12	20	5
Applications decided:	311	217	122
- Declared inadmissible or struck out (Single Judge)	299	200	115
- Declared inadmissible or struck out (Committee)	8	13	5
- 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:	964
Single Judge	44
Committee (3 Judges)	890
Chamber (7 Judges)	30
Grand Chamber (17 Judges)	0

Slovenia 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

Lekić v. Slovenia

11.12.2018

The case concerned striking a company off a court register and the subsequent liability of its managing director for its debts. The strike off procedure was used against the applicant's company under new legislation introduced in 1999, which gave courts the power to strike off dormant companies without having to wind them up. It resulted in him having to pay 32,795 euros to one of the company's creditors, the Railway Company of Slovenia.

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

Ališić and Others v. Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, Serbia, Slovenia and "The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia"

16.07.2014

Concerned the applicants' inability to recover "old" foreign-currency savings – deposited with two banks in what is now Bosnia and Herzegovina – following the dissolution of the former Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (SFRY).

The Court held:

With regard to Mr Šahdanović: unanimously, that there had been a violation of Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 (protection of property) and a violation of Article 13 (right to an effective remedy) by Serbia;

With regard to Ms Ališić and Mr Sadžak: unanimously, that there had been a violation of Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 and a violation of Article 13 by Slovenia;

With regard to the other respondent States: by a majority, that there had been no violation of Article 1 of Protocol No.1 and no violation of Article 13, and,

unanimously, that there had been no violation of Article 14 taken together with Article 13 and Article 1 of Protocol No. 1.

Kurić and others v. Slovenia

26.06.2012[1]

The applicants belong to a group of persons known as the "erased", who on 26 February 1992 lost their status as permanent residents following Slovenia's declaration of independence in 1991, and faced almost 20 years of extreme hardship. The number of "erased" people in 1991 amounted to 25,671.

Violation of Article 8 (right to respect for private and/or family life) of the European Convention on Human Rights;

Violation of Article 13 (right to an effective remedy) in combination with Article 8 of the Convention, and;

Violation of Article 14 (prohibition of discrimination) in combination with Article 8

The Court also decided to apply the pilot-judgment procedure, holding that the Government should, within one year, set up a compensation scheme for the "erased" in Slovenia. It decided it would adjourn examination of all similar applications in the meantime.

Šilih v. Slovenia

09.04.2009

Ineffectiveness of the proceedings conducted by the authorities to establish liability for the death of the applicant's son as a result of a medical error.

Violation of Article 2 (lack of an effective investigation)

Noteworthy cases, judgments delivered

Chamber

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

Boris Butolen v. Slovenia

26.04.2012

[1] In the same case, by a Grand Chamber judgment of 12 March 2014 on the just satisfaction, the Court held, unanimously, that the Slovenian Government was to pay the six applicants whose rights under the European Convention on Human Rights had been violated amounts between 29,400 and 72,770 euros (EUR) each.

Mr Butolen alleged that he had been ill-treated by police officers in February 2001.
Violation of Article 3 (treatment)
Violation of Article 3 (investigation)

Mandić and Jović v. Slovenia

20.10.2011
Detention conditions in Ljubljana Prison, Slovenia.
Violation of Article 3 and Article 13 (right to an effective remedy) in both cases

Matko v. Slovenia

02.11.2006
Violent arrest of the applicant by the police and lack of an effective investigation.
Violation of Article 3 (treatment and investigation)
No violation of Article 6 § 1 (right to a fair hearing within a reasonable time)

Rehbock v. Slovenia

28.11.2000
The case concerned the applicant's conviction of drug offences, the conditions of his arrest and detention, the lawfulness of his detention and the monitoring of his correspondence with the European Commission of Human Rights.
Violation of Article 3
Violation of Article 5 (right to liberty and security)
Violation of Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life)

Cases regarding Article 6

Dolenc v. Slovenia

20.10.2022
The case concerned an Israeli citizen who had been left paralysed after being operated on by the applicant, a well-known neurosurgeon, in a Ljubljana hospital and the ensuing proceedings in both Israel and Slovenia.
Violation of Article 6 § 1

Cimperšek v. Slovenia

30.06.2020
The case concerned the rejection by the Minister of Justice of Mr Cimperšek's application to become a court expert owing to a lack of the required personal qualities. The Minister referred to the contents of Mr Cimperšek's blog and emails he had sent to complain about the work of the Ministry.
Violation of Article 6 § 1

Gaspari v. Slovenia

21.07.2009
Constitutional appeals by the opposing party not served on the applicant.
Violation of Article 6 § 1

Right to be informed promptly of accusation/ right to an interpreter

Vizgirda v. Slovenia

28.08.2018
The case concerned the complaint of the applicant, whose native language is Lithuanian, that he had not had a fair trial after being charged with robbery because he had not understood the interpreting provided to him, which had been in Russian.
Violation of Article 6 §§ 1 and 3

Right to a fair hearing within a reasonable time

Lukenda v. Slovenia

06.10.2005
Pilot judgment concerning the excessive length of proceedings.
Violation of Article 6 § 1 and of Article 13 (right to an effective remedy) and existence of a systemic problem
Following the adoption of the *Lukenda* judgment, a law has been passed in Slovenia to remedy this systemic situation.
In the following cases the Court found violations of Article 6 § 1 on account of the length of the proceedings and of Article 13 (right to an effective remedy)

Sirc v. Slovenia

08.04.2008
Tomažič v. Slovenia
13.12.2007
Grzinčič v. Slovenia
03.05.2007
Švarc and Kavnik v. Slovenia
08.02.2007

Presumption of innocence

Bavčar v. Slovenia

07.09.2023
Mr Bavčar, a former Government minister, was found guilty of money laundering in 2016. The case concerned appeal proceedings during which the then Minister of Justice Goran Klemenčič had given

a television interview captioned "Mr Klemenčič: If the Bavčar case becomes time-barred, a lot of people will have to answer [for that]".
Violation of Article 6 § 2

Cases concerning Article 7 (no punishment without law)

Rola v. Slovenia
04.06.2019
The case concerned a liquidator's complaint that he had lost his licence to act in bankruptcy proceedings following his conviction for violent behaviour.
No violation of Article 7
Violation of Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 (protection of property)

Private and family life cases (Article 8)

X and Others v. Slovenia
(nos. 27746/22 and 28291/22)
19.12.2024
The case concerned custody decisions and contact rights following the separation of X from her children's father in 2018. It also concerned the reassignment of X's court case to a particular judge.
Violations of Article 8 with respect both to:
- the applicant children, as regards the order to remove them from X's (their mother's) care in March 2020, their not being represented in the contact and custody proceedings, and their not being allowed contact with their mother;
- X, for not being allowed contact with her children
Violation of Article 6 § 1 (right to a fair trial) as regards X's right to a tribunal established by law

Škoberne v. Slovenia
15.02.2024
The case concerned proceedings against a former judge and his conviction in 2013 for accepting bribes. His conviction had been based on statements by his two co-defendants who had admitted to being intermediaries and on traffic and location data obtained under the data-retention regime in force at the time in Slovenia.
Violation of Article 8
Also violation of Article 6 §§ 1 and 3 (d)

Hudorovič and Others v. Slovenia
10.03.2020
The case concerned complaints by the applicants, who are all Slovenian nationals of Roma origin, about an alleged lack of access to drinking water and sanitation, taking into consideration their lifestyle and minority status.
No violation of Article 8 in respect of the applicants in application no. 24816/14
No violation of Article 8 in respect of the applicants in application no. 25140/14
No violation of Article 14 (prohibition of discrimination) taken in conjunction with Article 8
No violation of Article 3 (prohibition of torture or inhuman or degrading treatment) taken alone or in conjunction with Article 14

Benedik v. Slovenia
24.04.2018
The case concerned the Slovenian police's failure to obtain a court order to access subscriber information associated with a dynamic IP address recorded by the Swiss law-enforcement authorities during their monitoring of users of a certain file-sharing network. This led to the applicant being identified after he had shared files over the network, including child pornography.
Violation of Article 8

Eberhard and M. v. Slovenia
01.12.2009
A father was hardly able to see his daughter for more than four years because of the Slovenian authorities' inactivity.
Violation of Article 8

Freedom of expression

(Article 10)

Mladina D.D. Ljubljana v. Slovenia (no. 2)
13.01.2026
The case concerned defamation proceedings in which the applicant company was held liable for defamation for having published a photo of a well-known Slovenian politician and his family alongside a photo of the German Nazi politician Joseph Goebbels.
Violation of Article 10

Cimperšek v. Slovenia

30.06.2020

The case concerned the rejection by the Minister of Justice of Mr Cimperšek's application to become a court expert owing to a lack of the required personal qualities. The Minister referred to the contents of Mr Cimperšek's blog and emails he had sent to complain about the work of the Ministry.

Violation of Article 10

Property rights
(Article 1 of Protocol No. 1)

Landika v. Slovenia

03.03.2026

The case concerned the applicants' inability to recover, under legislation enacted in Slovenia following the Court's 2014 Grand Chamber judgment in *Ališić and Others v. Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, Serbia, Slovenia and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia*, their predecessor's "old" foreign currency savings deposited in the Sarajevo branch of Ljubljana Bank (then a Slovenian bank), as the claim relating to those savings had been transferred in 1998 to a privatisation account administered by the authorities of Bosnia and Herzegovina.

No violation of Article 1 of Protocol No. 1

Press release in Slovenian.

Kotnik and Jukič v. Slovenia

06.03.2025

The case concerned the emergency measures taken by the Bank of Slovenia in 2013 and 2014 to protect the financial system. As a result of the measures, subordinated bonds and shares belonging to the applicants had been voided without compensation.

Case declared inadmissible for non-exhaustion of domestic remedies.

Rola v. Slovenia

04.06.2019

The case concerned a liquidator's complaint that he had lost his licence to act in bankruptcy proceedings following his conviction for violent behaviour.

No violation of Article 7 (no punishment without law)

Violation of Article 1 of Protocol No. 1

Right to free elections
(Article 3 of Protocol No. 1)

Zevnik and Others v. Slovenia

5.12.2019

The case concerned the authorities' rejection of lists submitted by a coalition party for elections in 2018 owing to the lists' lack of female candidates.

Noteworthy cases, decisions delivered

Inter-state case

Slovenia v. Croatia

16.12.2020

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

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

Anastasov and Others v. Slovenia

17.11.2016

The 212 applicants in this case belong to a group of people known as the "erased" (*izbrisani*). Former nationals of the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia ("the SFRY") with permanent residence in Slovenia, their names were deleted from Slovenia's Register of Permanent Residents following the dissolution of the SFRY, Slovenia's declaration of independence and passing of the "independence legislation" in 1991. They thus became aliens with no legal status in Slovenia and remained so for periods ranging from seven months to more than 22 years.

In a previous pilot judgment (*Kurić and Others v. Slovenia*,) of June 2012 the Court found that the Slovenian authorities had failed to regulate the issue of "erased" people and to provide them with adequate redress for the years during which they had been in a position of vulnerability and legal insecurity; it also ordered Slovenia to set up a domestic compensation scheme.

The Court was satisfied that the system introduced by the Slovenian Government (and its functioning in practice) following the *Kurić and Others* judgment offered to the remaining "erased" persons who had

regularised their legal status in Slovenia reasonable prospects of receiving compensation for the damage caused by the systemic violation of their Convention rights.
The Court decided:
- to close the pilot-judgment procedure initiated in *Kurić and Others*
- to strike the application out of its lists of cases

Kovačić and Others v. Slovenia
03.10.2008
Freezing of funds deposited by Croatian savers with a Slovenian bank prior to the dissolution of the former Yugoslavia.
Application struck out of the list (resolved at national level), but call issued to the successor States of the former Yugoslavia to proceed with negotiations on frozen savings as a matter of urgency.

Žunič v. Slovenia
18.10.2007
Excessive length of procedure.
Application declared inadmissible.

Predojević and Others v. Slovenia
07.06.2001
Group of cases concerning the retirement pensions of former members of the Yugoslav armed forces.
Complaints under Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 (protection of property) declared inadmissible.

Noteworthy pending cases

Grand Chamber

Advisory opinion Slovenia (no. P16-2026-003)
Request submitted on 5 March 2026
The Court has accepted a request from Slovenia's Supreme Court for an advisory opinion concerning landowners' property rights in relation to the construction of national roads.
The Supreme Court has asked the Court to provide guidance on whether allowing the issuance of a building permit and the construction of a motorway without first expropriating the affected land constitutes an unjustified interference with the landowners' property rights, as protected by Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 to the Convention and Article 33 of the Constitution of Slovenia.

Chamber

Regvar v. Slovenia (no. 36538/25)
Case communicated to the Government on 11 December 2025
The application concerns an obligation imposed on refugee counsellors to report certain information about their clients to the State authorities.

Kolar v. Slovenia (no. 656/25)
Case communicated to the Government on 20 June 2025
The application concerns the dismissal of a public employee for refusing to comply with COVID-19 related measures.

Kozole v. Slovenia (no. 678/25)
Case communicated to the Government on 9 July 2025
The application concerns the dismissal of employees of public entities or publicly owned companies for refusing to comply with COVID-19 related measures.

Du Toit v. Slovenia (no. 418/25)
Case communicated to the Government on 4 July 2025
The application concerns the dismissal of an employee in a private company for failing to comply with COVID-19 related measures.

Giuliatti Bajželj v. Slovenia (no. 3316/25)
Case communicated to the Government on 2 July 2025
The application concerns a complaint by the applicant that the investigation into the circumstances of her son's death had been ineffective.

Ristić and Others v. Slovenia (no. 16807/24)
Case communicated to the Government on 24 June 2025
The application concerns a complaint about the application of the domestic legislation adopted for the protection of "erased" persons.

Makro 5 Gradnje D.O.O v. Slovenia (no. 27043/24)
Case communicated to the Government on 15 November 2024
The application concerns a claim by the applicant company that a Municipal Spatial

Plan adopted by the Ankaran Municipality was unlawful in the part that concerned a change in the permitted use of its land.

X and Y v. Slovenia (no. 5112/23)

Case communicated to the Government on 2 September 2024 and 1 December 2025

The application concerns a prohibition on the export of embryos and the absolute time-limit on their storage.

Latin v. Slovenia (no. 15532/23)
Makovac v. Slovenia (no. 15525/23)

Case communicated to the Government on 1 February 2024

In these applications, Croatian fishing workers allege a breach of their right to an oral hearing and of other procedural rights under Article 6 (right to a fair trial) of the Convention in minor-offence proceedings.

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