



Slovenia

Ratified the European Convention on Human Rights in 1994

National Judge: Marko Bošnjak

[Judges' CVs](#) are available on the ECHR Internet site

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

The Court dealt with 1,831 applications concerning Slovenia in 2017, of which 1,818 were declared inadmissible or struck out. It delivered 12 judgments (concerning 13 applications), 10 of which found at least one violation of the European Convention on Human Rights.

Applications processed in	2015	2016	2017
Applications allocated to a judicial formation	213	239	374
Communicated to the Government	17	18	7
Applications decided:	263	303	1831
- Declared inadmissible or struck out (Single Judge)	224	293	1795
- Declared inadmissible or struck out (Committee)	23	2	20
- Declared inadmissible or struck out (Chamber)	1	4	3
- Decided by judgment	15	4	13
Interim measures:	4	6	6
- Granted	0	0	0
- Refused (including out of scope)	4	6	6

For information about the Court's judicial formations and procedure, see the [ECHR internet site](#)

Applications pending before the court on 01/01/2018	
Total pending applications*	143
Applications pending before a judicial formation:	123
Single Judge	57
Committee (3 Judges)	10
Chamber (7 Judges)	55
Grand Chamber (17 Judges)	1

*including applications for which completed application forms have not yet been received

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 **668** Registry staff members of whom **9** are Slovenian.

Noteworthy cases, judgments delivered

Grand Chamber

[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](#)

26.06.2012¹

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

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.

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

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 and Štrucl and others 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 dealing with Article 6

[Right to a fair hearing](#)

[Gaspari v. Slovenia](#)

21.07.2009

Constitutional appeals by the opposing party not served on the applicant.

[Violation of Article 6 § 1](#)

[Right to a fair hearing within a reasonable time](#)

[Lukenda v. Slovenia](#)

06.10.2005

Pilot judgment² 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.](#)

² Since 2004 and in response to the large number of cases deriving from systemic or structural problems in certain countries the Court has developed a pilot-judgment procedure. This consists in identifying in a single judgment systemic problems underlying a violation of the European Convention on Human Rights and indicating in that judgment the remedial measures required to resolve such situations. The pilot-judgment procedure is not only intended to facilitate effective implementation by respondent states of individual and general measures necessary to comply with the Court's judgments, but also induces the respondent State to resolve large numbers of individual cases arising from the same structural problem at domestic level, thus reinforcing the principle of subsidiarity which underpins the Convention system.

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

Cases dealing with private and family life (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](#)

Noteworthy cases, decisions delivered

[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

Lekić v. Slovenia (no. 36480/07)

The case concerns the striking off of a company that the applicant had a share in, and his subsequent liability for the company's debts.

Relying in particular on Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 (protection of property) to the Convention, Mr Lekić complains, *inter alia*, that the striking-off of the company and his ensuing liability interfered with his property rights and amounted to an unlawful deprivation of property.

In its Chamber [judgment](#) of 14 February 2017, the Court held, unanimously, that there had been no violation of Article 1 of Protocol No. 1, finding that the national

courts' finding that Mr Lekić was an active member of the company and thus liable for the payment of its debts was reasonable.

Case [referred to the Grand Chamber](#) on 18 September 2017

Grand Chamber hearing on 14 March 2018

Chamber

Hudorovič and Novak and others v. Slovenia (nos. 24816/14 and 25140/14)

Cases [communicated](#) to the Slovenian Government on 8 April 2015.

The case concerns an alleged failure of the domestic authorities to provide the applicants, members of the Roma community, access to basic public utilities, such as drinking water and sanitation, in their dwellings which had been built on state owned land decades ago. Relying on Article 3 (prohibition of inhuman or degrading treatment) and 8 (right to private and family life) of the Convention, the applicants complain of the lack of basic public utilities, as well as of the lack of fundamental rights as the majority population. Under Articles 14 (prohibition of discrimination) in conjunction with Articles 3 and 8 of the Convention, the applicants allege that the Slovenian authorities have not taken any steps aimed at eliminating inequality in living conditions of the applicants' communities.

Benedik v. Slovenia (no. 62357/14)

Case [communicated](#) to the Slovenian Government on 4 April 2015

The case concerns an alleged violation of the applicant's privacy of electronic communication on account of the police having obtained his personal data from the internet service provider without a court order.

Relying on Article 8 (right to private life) of the Convention, Mr Benedik complains that his right to privacy was breached on account of the fact that the data on his IP address and consequently on his identity were gathered without a court order.

Vizgirda v. Slovenia (no. 59868/08)

Case [communicated](#) to the Slovenian Government on 17 June 2014

The case concerns the alleged lack of prompt information, in a language the applicant could understand, of the reasons

for his arrest and the charges against him, as well as his inability to participate effectively in the ensuing criminal trial due to his limited command of Russian, the language into which the translation of documents and interpretation of oral statements was provided.

Mr Vizgirda relies on Articles 5 § 2 (everyone who is arrested shall be informed promptly, in a language which he

understands, of the reasons for his arrest and of any charge against him) and 6 §§ 1 (right to a fair trial) and 3(a) (right to be informed promptly of the accusations against him) and (e) (right to an interpreter) of the Convention.

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