

SECRETARIAT / SECRÉTARIAT

SECRETARIAT OF THE COMMITTEE OF MINISTERS
SECRÉTARIAT DU COMITÉ DES MINISTRES

COMMITTEE
OF MINISTERS
COMITÉ
DES MINISTRES



Contact: Zoe Bryanston-Cross
Tel: 03.90.21.59.62

Date: 24/11/2022

DH-DD(2022)1304

Documents distributed at the request of a Representative shall be under the sole responsibility of the said Representative, without prejudice to the legal or political position of the Committee of Ministers.

Meeting: 1451st meeting (December 2022) (DH)

Item reference: Action Plan (24/11/2022)

Communication from Hungary concerning the group of cases of X.Y. v. Hungary (Application No. 43888/08)

* * * * *

Les documents distribués à la demande d'un/e Représentant/e le sont sous la seule responsabilité dudit/de ladite Représentant/e, sans préjuger de la position juridique ou politique du Comité des Ministres.

Réunion : 1451^e réunion (décembre 2022) (DH)

Référence du point : Plan d'action (24/11/2022)

Communication de la Hongrie concernant le groupe d'affaires X.Y. c. Hongrie (requête n° 43888/08)
(anglais uniquement)

**Revised Group Action Plan of 24 November 2022
in the cases of**

DGI

24 NOV. 2022

SERVICE DE L'EXECUTION
DES ARRETS DE LA CEDH

X.Y. v. Hungary (Appl. No. 43888/08, judgment of 19/03/2013)
Hagyó v. Hungary (Appl. No. 52624/10, judgment of 23/04/2013)
Süveges v. Hungary (Appl. No. 50255/12, judgment of 05/01/2016)
Szekeres and Others v. Hungary (Appl. No. 21763/14, judgment of 07/03/2019)
Süveges v. Hungary (Appl. No. 20714/19, judgment of 06/02/2020)
Farkas v. Hungary (Appl. No. 61543/15, judgment of 01/09/2020)
Ábrahám and Others v. Hungary (Appl. No. 50892/19, judgment of 22/10/2020)
Kerekes and Others v. Hungary (Appl. No. 29343/20, judgment of 15/04/2021)
Gujdi v. Hungary (Appl. No. 40052/20, judgment of 22/07/2021)
Milák and Others v. Hungary (Appl. No. 2130/20, judgment of 30/09/2021)
Gábor and Others v. Hungary (Appl. No. 43378/20, judgment of 30/09/2021)
Baranyi and Others v. Hungary (Appl. No. 45540/20, judgment of 14/10/2021)
Csikós and Others v. Hungary (Appl. No. 44001/20, judgment of 02/12/2021)
Corneanu and Others v. Hungary (Appl. No. 45021/20, judgment of 13/01/2022)
Besirovic and Others v. Hungary (Appl. No. 32917/20, judgment of 10/02/2022)
Lakatos and Others v. Hungary (Appl. No. 1561/21, judgment of 24/02/2022)
D.S. and Others v. Hungary (Appl. No. 41602/17, judgment of 31/03/2022)
Bander and Others v. Hungary (Appl. No. 21980/21, judgment of 31/03/2022)
Orosz and Others v. Hungary (Appl. No. 76862/17, judgment of 14/04/2022)

Introductory case summary

1. All of the cases concerning different violations of the applicants' right to liberty and security on account of: their unlawful detention (Article 5 § 1); their unreasonably long pre-trial detention (Article 5 § 3); the domestic courts failure to give sufficient reasons for their continued pre-trial detention (Article 5 § 3); an infringement of the principle of "equality of arms" as they had no access to the relevant material of the investigation when challenging their detention (Article 5 § 4); and the excessive length of the judicial review of their detention (Article 5 § 4).
2. Certain applications also concern additional violations, such as Article 8 in respect of restriction on prison visits (*Hagyó*; in *Szekeres and Others* – application of Mr Péntek), Article 3 in respect of conditions of detention (*Hagyó*) and Article 6 § 1 in respect of excessive length of the criminal proceeding (*Süveges*; in *Szabbah and Others* – applications of Mr Gémes, Mr Király, Ms Király; in *Corneanu* – application of Mr Ádám; in *Orosz and Others* – Mr Marozsán, Mr Fehér).

I. Individual measures

1. *Just satisfaction*

No.	Applicant's name and Application no.	Date of Definitive Judgment	Payment Deadline	Amount awarded for pecuniary and non-pecuniary damage and costs and expenses per applicant	Date of payment
1.	X.Y. 43888/08	19/06/2013	19/09/2013	EUR 22,500 (= HUF 6,756,075)	22/08/2013
2.	Hagyó 52624/10	23/07/2013	23/10/2013	EUR 18,500 (= HUF 5,522,805)	23/09/2013
3.	Süveges 50255/12	02/05/2016	02/08/2016	EUR 8,000 (= HUF 2,519,840)	19/07/2016
4.	Szekeres and Others v. Hungary 21763/14	07/03/2019			
	Viktor Miklós KOSZTADINOVSZKI 42819/14		07/06/2019	EUR 2,200 (=HUF 718,300)	28/05/2019
5.	Gábor and Others v. Hungary 43378/20	30/09/2021			
	Péter PARTALI 5079/21		30/12/2021	EUR 3,300 (= HUF 1.206.183)	26/10/2021
	Torres Silva WAGNER 3683/21		30/12/2021	EUR 3,400 (=HUF 1.227.400)	18/10/2021
6.	Corneanu and Others v. Hungary 45021/20	13/01/2022			
	Emil FARKAS 10336/21		13/04/2022	EUR 3,400 (=HUF 1.209.244)	15/02/2022
7.	Lakatos and Others v. Hungary 1561/21	24/02/2022			
	Gyula LAKATOS 1561/21		24/05/2022	EUR 5,100 (=HUF 1.903.775)	25/04/2022
	Ferenc ARNOLD 5761/21		24/05/2022	EUR 4,100 (=HUF 1,530,489)	25/04/2022
	Attila LÁSZLÓ 19324/21		24/05/2022	EUR 3,200 (=HUF 1,194,528)	25/04/2022
	Ferenc Miklós LÁZÓK 19376/21		24/05/2022	EUR 6,800 (=HUF 2.538.372)	25/04/2022
	Szabolcs BODÓ 19639/21		24/05/2022	EUR 3,000 (=HUF 1,119,870)	25/04/2022
	Dezső VARGA 25698/21		24/05/2022	EUR 5,100 (=HUF 1,919,079)	26/04/2022
	Pierre Francesco VASTA 25702/21		24/05/2022	EUR 2,000 (=HUF 752.580)	26/04/2022
	Zsolt TOKODI 26914/21		24/05/2022	EUR 2,300 (=HUF 858,567)	25/04/2022
	Ervis KRUIJA 27717/21		24/05/2022	3,100 (=HUF 1,166,499)	26/04/2022

No.	Applicant's name and Application no.	Date of Definitive Judgment	Payment Deadline	Amount awarded for pecuniary and non-pecuniary damage and costs and expenses per applicant	Date of payment
	Emil Dávid MERUCZA 34350/21		24/05/2022	EUR 3,500 (=HUF 1,317,015)	26/04/2022
8.	D.S. and Others v. Hungary 41602/17	31/03/2022			
	D.S. 41602/17		31/06/2022	EUR 1,800 (=HUF 688,950)	23/05/2022
	Zsanett HORVÁTH 9599/21		31/06/2022	EUR 4,900 (=HUF 1.885.716)	16/05/2022
	Viola MEZŐ 9608/21		31/06/2022	EUR 4,000 (=HUF 1,531,000)	23/05/2022
	János Norbert BODNÁR 12008/21		31/06/2022	EUR 3,900 (=HUF 1.500.876)	16/05/2022
	Máté Mihály GÉMES 12023/21		31/06/2022	EUR 4,900 (=HUF 1.875.475)	23/05/2022
	Anita KIRÁLY 17702/21		31/06/2022	EUR 6,600 (=HUF 2.539.944)	16/05/2022
	Csaba KIRÁLY 17705/21		31/06/2022	EUR 6,600 (=HUF 2,539,944)	16/05/2022
	László Szilárd BEDŐ 18988/21		31/06/2022	EUR 3,500 (=HUF 1,339,625)	23/05/2022
	József HORVÁTH 20976/21		31/06/2022	EUR 3,400 (=HUF 1.308.456)	16/05/2022
	Melinda KOLOMPÁR 21388/21		31/06/2022	EUR 4,800 (=HUF 1.837.200)	23/05/2022
9.	Bander and Others v. Hungary 21980/21	31/03/2022			
	Ferenc BANDER 21980/21		30/06/2022	EUR 2,000 (=HUF 765,500)	23/05/2022
	József FICSÓRI 24004/21		30/06/2022	EUR 2,600 (=HUF 1,000,584)	16/05/2022
	Zsolt ORSÓS 30115/21		30/06/2022	EUR 4,400 (=HUF 1,684,100)	23/05/2022
	Mária BODA 31343/21		30/06/2022	EUR 2,700 (=HUF 1.033.425)	23/05/2022
	Rafael Renato KOZICSKA 33461/21		30/06/2022	EUR 3,000 (=HUF 1.346.940)	16/05/2022
	Gusztáv BARTA 35878/21		30/06/2022	EUR 4,600 (=HUF 1,760,650)	23/05/2022
	János KISS 36646/21		30/06/2022	EUR 2,700 (=HUF 1.033.425)	23/05/2022
	Gábor DRIMUS 36651/21		30/06/2022	EUR 3,500 (=HUF 1.346.940)	16/05/2022
	Attila SZABÓ 36655/21		30/06/2022	EUR 3,400 (=HUF 1.308.456)	16/05/2022
	Imre LACZKÓ 36760/21		30/06/2022	EUR 2,500 (=HUF 956.875)	23/05/2022

2. The applicants' current circumstances

	Applicant's name, date of birth, ECtHR application number	Whether the detention has ended in the meantime, and if so, when and for what reason; if not, for what reason has it been extended?
1.	Zoltán FARKAS 61543/15	The detention of the accused was terminated on 6 June 2016 . The accused was released with immediate effect and his house arrest was ordered until 6 June 2016. Subsequently, following the termination of his house arrest, he was banned from leaving his place of residence.
2.	Péter SÜVEGES 50255/12	Detention ended on 26 March 2020 . Proceedings were terminated at second instance, the enforcement of the imposed sentence of imprisonment was started.
3.	Hoan NGUYEN QUOC 55646/19	Detention ended on 23 February 2022 . Proceedings were terminated at second instance, the enforcement of the imposed sentence of imprisonment was started.
4.	Attila TÚRÓ 8280/20	Detention ended on 4 October 2021 . Proceedings were terminated at second instance, the enforcement of the imposed sentence of imprisonment was started.
5.	Kevin Joel RENÉ 33936/20	Detention ended on 17 February 2022 . Proceedings were terminated at second instance, the enforcement of the imposed sentence of imprisonment was started.
6.	Róbert GUJDI 40052/20	The defendant was placed in detention until 19 October 2021 , when proceedings were terminated under a final decision, therefore since then convict has been spending his sentence imposed under a final decision.
7.	Imre POKORNYI 10036/21	He is in detention until the termination of the <i>second instance</i> proceedings under a final decision but maximum for the period of the sentence of imprisonment imposed under the non-final judgment.
8.	Ferenc OLÁH 44541/20	The detention of the accused was terminated and he was released with immediate effect on 16 September 2020 . At the same time his criminal supervision was ordered until the promulgation of the first instance court decision. On 10 September 2021, in its judgment the first instance court sentenced him, and at the same time ordered him to be detained until the end of the second instance proceedings. Detention ended on 6 July 2022 . Proceedings were terminated at second instance, the enforcement of the imposed sentence of imprisonment was started.
9.	Rafal BOROWY 45545/20	Detention ended on 18 January 2022 . At the same time his criminal supervision was ordered.
10.	Dániel DEMETER 46313/20	Detention ended on 2 September 2021 . At the same time his criminal supervision was ordered.
11.	László KOVÁCS 1606/21	The detention was ordered on 10 May 2019 and the coercive measure lasted until 2 December 2020 . At the same time, the court ordered his criminal supervision, limited to his address.
12.	István Róbert PAOR 1612/21	Proceedings were terminated at second instance on 1 October 2021 . The defendant was in pre-trial detention from 5 April 2019 until the adoption of the decision on the merits.
13.	Péter PARTALI 5079/21	His detention was terminated on 14 December 2021 , since then the defendant has been serving his final sentence of imprisonment.
14.	Martyniuk SERHII 12093/21	His detention was terminated on 22 September 2021 , and a less severe coercive measure affecting personal liberty, namely the accused's criminal supervision was ordered.
15.	Lóránt BARANYI 45540/20	The court ordered his detention until the first instance court decision taken in the preparation of the trial, but for a maximum of 1 month, i.e. until 26 February 2019. Subsequently the accused was in <i>detention</i> until 21 October 2019, under <i>criminal supervision</i> from 21 October 2019 to 9 December 2019, under <i>arrest</i> from 9 December 2019 to 12 December 2019, in <i>detention</i> again until 14 July 2020, and under criminal supervision from 15 July 2020 .
16.	Gábor CSIKÓS 44001/20	The accused is in detention . The first instance court has maintained his detention until the termination of the second instance proceedings. On account of the risk of absconding, the length of the imprisonment imposed, and the fact that the <i>defendant removed</i> the electronic tracking device while he was under criminal supervision.
17.	Alfréd OLÁH 10618/21	The accused is still in detention . The second instance court has maintained his detention until the termination of the second instance proceedings.

18.	Szabolcs NÉMETH 11090/21	Detention ended on 26 May 2022 . Proceedings were terminated at second instance, the enforcement of the imposed sentence of imprisonment was started.
19.	Barbara SÁRKÖZI 13349/21	Detention was terminated on 10 March 2022 . Proceedings were terminated at second instance.
20.	Zsolt LAKATOS 19315/21	Detention was terminated on 15 October 2021 , proceedings were finally terminated, and the defendant began to serve his sentence of imprisonment.
21.	Attila FILIPOVICS 22941/21	On 10 February 2022, the court maintained the detention of the accused until the end of the second instance proceedings.
22.	László DUDÁS 22943/21	He is in detention pending the first instance decision on the merits.
23.	Csilla BALOG 5770/21	Detention was terminated - from 13 September 2019 the defendant was under arrest, from 15 September 2019 until 28 February 2022 she was in detention, and then under criminal supervision. Currently she is serving her sentence of imprisonment, which was imposed on her on 30 June 2022 under a final judgment.
24.	Sándor KOLOMPÁR 15049/21	He has not been in detention , on 19 January 2022 he was placed under criminal supervision.
25.	István BALÁZS 19636/21	On 17 March 2022 , his detention was terminated and his criminal supervision was ordered until the promulgation of the first instance decision on the merits.
26.	Tamás Zsolt GOMBÁR 25961/21	His detention was terminated on 9 June 2022 and a less severe coercive measure was imposed. Reason: on 27 August 2022 the maximum statutory period (3 years) would have expired.
27.	Gyula LAKATOS 1561/21	He is not in detention , on 23 September 2021 he began to serve his sentence of imprisonment imposed under a final judgment in another case.
28.	Viola MEZŐ 9608/21	The detention was maintained in respect of Viola Mező, after the promulgation of the court's non-final decision on the merits - until the termination of the second instance proceedings - in view of the classification of the offence and the life sentence imposed. The case is pending on the court of appeal.
29.	János Norbert BODNÁR 12008/21	He is in detention.
30.	Máté Mihály GÉMES 12023/21	He is not in detention . On 7 July 2022 his criminal supervision was ordered until the promulgation of the first instance decision on the merits.
31.	Melinda KOLOMPÁR 21388/21	On 10 February 2022 , the court terminated the detention of the accused and ordered her criminal supervision until the termination of the second instance proceedings. The reason for the termination was that by including his detention, the accused had already served 3 years, 6 months and 24 days from his 8 years imprisonment imposed under a non-final decision, and release on parole was also a possibility. Therefore, the risk of absconding could be eliminated by ordering criminal supervision.
32.	Zsolt PAP 16845/21	The defendant's detention was terminated on 2 June 2022 . On that date the High Court passed a judgment which became final on 2 June 2022. The High Court acquitted the accused from the charges and ordered his mandatory medical treatment.
33.	Norbert REITER-KOVÁCS 32329/21	On 29 April 2022 the court passed a decision on the merits in respect of Norbert Reiter-Kovács. After the promulgation of its decision, the court terminated the accused's detention and ordered his release . According to the reasoning, the grounds for the coercive measure affecting personal liberty no longer existed, by including the period of detention and the period of the criminal supervision the first accused had already spent 2 years and 9 months from his sentence of imprisonment, therefore the risk of absconding no longer existed, also in view of the fact that in the second instance proceedings his presence was not necessary.

3. In twenty-seven cases the applicants having been released from detention or having been sentenced to imprisonment, or have not been in detention, therefore no further individual measures were considered necessary in these cases.

II. General measures

1. Informations on the practise of the prosecution

4. The Act on Criminal Procedure XC of 2017 (hereinafter the: ACP) has brought about a change of approach in the practice of coercive measures affecting arrest and, more broadly, affecting liberty, which require judicial authorisation. There are papers in the professional literature, which argue that in recent years the application of the law has fortunately started to move in the right direction, so that deprivation of personal liberty before a final judgment is only taken in the most necessary cases, on the basis of a reasoned decision and for a reasonable period of time, and the change in attitude is clearly evident.
5. When making a decision on the issue of a coercive measure with judicial authorisation affecting personal liberty, such as the proposition for arrest, the prosecution authorities shall act in accordance with the principles of necessity, proportionality and graduality pursuant to Section 2 (3) of the ACP, and shall apply the provisions of Section 271 (1) of the ACP in a prudent manner so that the coercive measure results in the restriction of the fundamental rights of the person concerned only to the extent and for the duration that is most necessary. The guiding principle for the choice of the type of coercive measure is the provision of Section 271 (2) of the ACP, which in practice means that the prosecution, before proposing an arrest, takes a position on a case-by-case basis as to whether it is necessary to use coercive measures at all, and if so, whether it is appropriate (sufficient) to issue a stay away order and/or to order criminal supervision for the purpose to be achieved. If not, then the possibility of the proposition of an arrest may be considered.
6. According to the statistics of the Prosecutor General's Office, the ratio between prosecution motions for arrest and court orders of arrest was as follows:

year	motion by the investigating authority	Prosecutor's proposition on the basis of a motion	Prosecutor's proposition on the basis of a motion or <i>ex officio</i>	court-ordered (provisional) arrest
2015	6205	4842	5075	4453
2016	5936	4686	4846	4199
2017	5694	4420	4552	3997
2018	4022	3058	3557	3070
2019	3750	2931	3759	3330
2020	4471	3604	4359	3871
2021	5344	4456	5151	4685

7. The table shows that the prosecution office is critical of the investigating authorities' proposals for arrests and that arrests are ordered by the courts in 86-90% of the prosecutors' proposals.

8. The number of arrests showed a downward trend until 2019. The subsequent *increase is related to the structure of crime and the personal circumstances and criminal history of the offenders* rather than to prosecutorial motions and judicial decisions ignoring Section 2 (3) and Section 271(1) to (2) of the CPA. In particular, in the case of the recently prominent crime of human trafficking, in view of the personal circumstances of the perpetrators, coercive measures other than arrest are practically out of the question.
9. However, research also supports a reduction in the scale of arrests in Hungary. An analysis across five continents has shown that Europe is the only continent to show a significant decrease in the number of (preliminary) arrests since 2000. The study, which covered Hungary as well as England and Wales and the Netherlands, found a 42% decrease, with a simultaneous increase of minimum 15% worldwide, with some countries (and continents) showing much higher increases. Of the three European countries identified, Hungary is in the middle taking into account the proportion of arrested persons among detainees.¹
10. In addition to the existence of reasonable suspicion, prosecutors take into account the likelihood that the offence can be proven, the type and level of the expected punishment, the suspect's criminal record and the nature of the offence when requesting an arrest. On this basis, the motions are made in such a way that they contain the grounds on the basis of which only the ordering or prolongation of the arrest can serve the purpose of a successful prosecution. In addition to the evidence supporting the existence of reasonable suspicion, motions for orders shall contain the facts which, in the view of the prosecution, justify the arrest. In addition to the changed legal environment, the activity of the investigating judges also has a jurisprudential impact: decisions of the investigating judges that take into account the requirement of reasonable necessity and proportionality and the case law of the European Court of Human Rights result in more prudent and moderate prosecutorial practice in the submission of motions.
11. In the matter of prolonging or terminating the arrest, or replacing it with a less severe coercive measure, being subject to judicial authorisation, the prosecutor acting in the case shall, in addition to the above-mentioned rules of the CPA, continuously assesses the status of the investigation in which the arrest was ordered.
12. Section 24 (7) of Decree No. 9/2018 (VI. 29) of the Prosecutor General on the Preparation of Preliminary Proceedings and measures closing a proceeding requires prosecutors to take all legal measures in the case of an arrested person to ensure that the detention is limited to the time strictly necessary and that the procedural acts necessary for the establishment of facts relevant for the application of criminal and criminal procedure law and for the assessment of ancillary issues in criminal proceedings are carried out without delay and are in any event carried out continuously. In the case of juvenile suspects, a similar requirement is contained in Section 2 (3) of the Decree No. 11/2018 (VI. 29) of the Prosecutor General on the performance of special prosecutorial tasks in connection with juvenile criminal cases.
13. When deciding on the necessity of a motion to extend the detention, the prosecution takes into account the strengthening or weakening of the well-founded suspicion, the result of the

¹ Erika Róth: The New System of Coercive Measures Affecting Personal Liberty, Miskolc Law Review 2021, No. 5

evidence so far, the change in other special reasons for the detention, and the possibility of applying criminal supervision in case of a less severe coercive measure.

14. When taking a decision on whether to prolong the arrest, it is particularly important if the principle of expediency (i.e. the principle to handle the case out of turn) is violated or the investigation is not progressing at all. In such cases, prosecutors will carefully consider whether there are compelling reasons to request a prolongation of the arrest or to request a less severe coercive measure, taking into account the specific reason for the failure to act.
15. As regards the duration of arrests, the prosecution statistics for the period 2015-2021 show that the highest proportions of arrests last for 3-4 months and 5-6 months respectively. The number of arrests over 1 year is not high in relation to the number of arrests ordered, but shows a slight upward trend.
16. The number of other coercive measures ordered by the court instead of an arrest has not changed in magnitude [2019: 262; 2020: 287; 2021: 279].
17. In the case of defendants in custody at the time of indictment, the time from indictment to final decision on the case is influenced by many factors (the defendants, the act being the ground for the indictment, the number of measures as part of the evidence proceeding, whether a judgment can be handed down during the preparatory hearing, etc.).

2. Statistical data

a) On persons serving detention in penitentiary institutions

18. In 2020, 2021 and in the first half of 2022, the total annual number of persons (including juveniles) in custody in prisons is as follows as follows:

Year	persons in detention ²
2020	2734
2021	3419
2022.01.01.-06.30.	3659

Year	Prison population (last day of the year)	No. of pre-trial detentions (last day of the year)(% re prison population)
2020	16,752	3,421 (20.4%)
2021	18,623	4,380 (23.5%)
2022.01.01. – 2022. 06.30.	18,816	4,202 (22.3%)

b) On the decisions of the national courts

19. Following the entry into force of the new Act on Criminal Procedure, from 31 August 2018 to 31 August 2022, detentions were ordered in 13 781 cases. In 28 697 cases extensions of detentions, and in 2 222 cases other coercive measures were ordered by the courts.

² The above figures do not include the number of persons serving a transfer/receiving arrest.

3. Excessive length of judicial review of detention

20. Concerning the delays in relation to the adjudication of appeals filed against decisions ordering or extending detentions and in relation to the adjudication of mandatory reviews, information can only be provided after an examination of the case files of the cases at issue, but data gained from the statistical database show that in review cases the courts, on an average, determined in 18 days whether a detention lasting for more than a year (mandatory review after one year and after one and a half year) was or was not justified.

4. Awareness raising and trainings activities

a) The following training courses on the use of coercive measures subject to judicial authorisation affecting personal liberty have been held in the prosecution organisation:

21. Before the entry into force of the ACP, a series of national training courses were held for the entire prosecution staff in order to familiarise them with the ACP and prepare them for its application. In total, 2,120 persons - all prosecutors, deputy prosecutors and prosecutors with the exception of those permanently absent - attended 61 training days. Centralised training sessions were held in 14 locations nationwide over 8 months, in Budapest and regionally, between 18 September 2017 and 5 April 2018.
22. The preparation for the entry into force of the ACP was supplemented by a series of centrally organised, regionally held national training courses, followed by further training, meetings and discussions at the Prosecutor General's offices. During the trainings it was underlined that the ACP emphasises the principle of gradualness in the system of coercive measures affecting personal liberty. In line with this, it is appropriate to develop a prosecutorial practice and approach according to which deprivation of liberty or more severe coercive measures should only be taken as a last resort.
23. In the training for 35 assistant prosecutors, held on 6-9 March 2017 as part of the training of assistant prosecutors, the research paper of the Hungarian Helsinki Committee entitled "*The practice of pre-trial detention: the examination of alternative coercive measures and judicial decision-making*" was presented, which was made available on the Intranet.
24. The Prosecutor's Office has not organised separate training on the subject of coercive measures restricting personal liberty and arrest, but there are regular presentations and questions at consultations. Questions and problems arising in the course of the application of the law in relation to the provisions of the CPA are regularly included in the programmes of the criminal training courses and consultations for all participants (deputy criminal prosecutor, prosecutor, investigating prosecutor, junior prosecutor, assistant prosecutor, prosecutor, prosecutor's counsel) included in the annual training and further training plan.
25. The following courses were held by the Hungarian Prosecution Training Centre, at the course for the preparation of the bar exam, Part B:
- 22 March 2021: Enforcement of coercive measures of criminal procedural law affecting personal liberty,
 - 22 February 2022: Coercive measures restricting personal liberty (online)
 - 12 October 2021: Coercive measures affecting personal liberty (course for prosecutors, assistant prosecutors and junior prosecutors).

26. However, the Prosecutor General's Office has not held any consultations with the National Office of the Judiciary, but there have been consultations between the heads of their largest organisation unit, the Metropolitan Office of the General Prosecutor, and the Investigative Judicial Group of the Central District Court of Buda, which operates in the area of its jurisdiction, on practical issues related to coercive measures.

b) Trainings organized by the National Office for the Judiciary in 2022

27. In spring 2022, 287 participants (judges, draftsmen, and court secretaries) attended the training course on “Fundamental rights in criminal proceedings” and 287 participants (judges, draftsmen, court secretaries) attended the training course "Insight into the system of coercive measures". In September 2022, the Agent before ECHR held a training for judges about the infringement found by the ECtHR and the requirements imposed on national authorities.
28. The National Office for the Judiciary has organised three training courses on the changes of the rules applicable to coercive measures, the series of lectures, targeted specifically for investigating judges, took place between 22 November and 13 December 2022.
29. A training material on Act No. XC of 2017 on Criminal Procedure presenting in detail the domestic practice on placement in detention and the relevant case law of the ECtHR has been made available to judges, court secretaries and trainee judges.

c) Professional Days held by the Curia

30. Following the meeting with the experts of the Department for the Execution of Judgments of the ECHR at the Curia, the Curia organised a training on “How to draft the reasoning for arrest warrants in accordance with the ECtHR's expectations”, which was held on 3-4 November 2022 in the framework of the Curia Professional Days. During the training, both the head of the Criminal Chamber of the Curia (who was present in person at the above-mentioned meeting) and all of the presidents of the Criminal Chamber gave a lecture on the known problems, including a detailed discussion with the judges attending the training on the requirements that have been expressed in relation to the reasoning of detention orders and that have already been published by the Curia in various forms.

d) Publication and dissemination

31. The judgments have been published on the website of the Government (see: <http://igazsagugyiinformaciok.kormany.hu/az-emberi-jogok-europai-birosaganak-iteletei>) and have been disseminated to the competent national authorities. The National Judicial Council, and the Curia was directly informed about the cases.

III. Conclusions of the respondent state

The Government consider that the measures adopted remedied the consequences for the applicants of the violations found by the Court in their respective cases and are adequate and sufficient for preventing similar violations in the future.

Budapest, 24 November 2022



Zoltán Tallódi
Agent for the Government of Hungary